



**QUEEN'S
UNIVERSITY
BELFAST**

Servius in the Carolingian Age: A Case Study of London, British Library, Harley 2782

O'Sullivan, S. (2016). Servius in the Carolingian Age: A Case Study of London, British Library, Harley 2782. *Journal of Medieval Latin*, 26, 77-123. <https://doi.org/10.1484/J.JML.5.112081>

Published in:
Journal of Medieval Latin

Document Version:
Peer reviewed version

Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

Publisher rights
Copyright 2016 Journal of Medieval Latin
This work is made available online in accordance with the publisher's policies.

General rights
Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy
The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact openaccess@qub.ac.uk.

Servius in the Carolingian Age: A Case Study of London, British Library, Harley 2782

Sinéad O'Sullivan
Queen's University, Belfast

Abstract

In Harley 2782, Servius's late antique commentary on Vergil was transmitted as an independent text, edited, corrected, glossed, marked for mythological information, provided with *NOTA* monograms and headings, as well as interspersed and augmented with *scholia adespota* and non-Servian material. The scholarly conventions attested in this manuscript show the kinds of critical apparatus that fed into the early medieval appropriation of Vergil and above all demonstrate that Servius was a staple of the Carolingian world.

Dans le manuscrit Harley 2782, le commentaire tardo-antique de Servius sur Virgile a été transmis sous forme d'un document indépendant, modifié, corrigé, glosé, préparé pour retrouver les informations mythologiques, enrichi de monogrammes *Nota*, ainsi qu'il a été entrecoupé et augmenté à l'aide des *scholia adespota* et du matériel non Servien. Les conventions scolastiques attestées par ce manuscrit montrent quels types d'apparats critiques alimentaient le début de l'appropriation médiévale de Virgile et surtout prouvent que Servius était une composante essentielle du monde carolingien.

Servius, the most important and most complete surviving late antique commentary on Vergil's three major works, circulated as glosses, as full-fledged commentary accompanying the text of Vergil in the margins of manuscripts, and as an independent text in ninth- and tenth-century manuscripts.¹ As a staple of the

¹ By the term "Servius" I denote Servius's commentary on Vergil. In this period Servius is often found accompanying the text of Vergil in parallel columns, for example in Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Reg. lat. 1669 (saec. IX^{med} or IX^{3/4}, Rheims). The text of the manuscript is divided into three columns and contains the text of Vergil with accompanying commentary in the margins which draws heavily on Servius. For a description of the manuscript, see Silvia Ottaviano, "Il Reg. lat. 1669: un'edizione di Virgilio d'età carolingia," *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae* 16 (Rome, 2009), 259-324; and Bernhard Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen): Teil III: Padua-Zwickau (aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben von Birgit Ebersperger)*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für die Herausgabe der mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz (Wiesbaden, 2014), Nr. 6795, p. 441. Louis Holtz, "Les manuscrits latins à gloses et à commentaires de l'antiquité à l'époque carolingienne," in *Atti del convegno internazionale 'Il libro e il testo'*, ed. Cesare Questa and Renato Raffaelli (Urbino, 1984), pp. 139-67, at p. 154 calls this kind of presentation "l'édition commentée." For lists and discussion of manuscripts transmitting the commentary of Servius, see Max Manitius, *Handschriften antiker Autoren in mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskatalogen* (Leipzig, 1933), pp. 197-200; John J. Savage, "The Manuscripts of the Commentary of Servius Danielis on Virgil," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 43 (1932), 77-121; John J. Savage, "The Manuscripts of Servius's Commentary on Virgil," *Harvard Studies in Classical*

Carolingian world, Servius was both edited and corrected, as well as subject to interpolation and the addition of non-Servian materials. London, British Library, Harley 2782, which transmits Servius as a separate work, demonstrates these trends.² For the *Georgics* and *Aeneid*, we find the vulgate Servius³ and for the *Eclogues* a variorum commentary comprising a mixture of Servius and comments from the so-called Bern scholia or *Scholia Bernensia*.⁴

This paper examines the importance of Servius in the Carolingian world through a case study of a single manuscript. It contains an introduction sketching the context of Vergil, Servius, and their reception in the Carolingian age and focuses on the Harley manuscript providing detailed analysis of how the scribes of the manuscript endeavoured to create a “best edition” of Servius, as well as

Philology 45 (1934), 157-204; Charles E. Murgia, *Prolegomena to Servius 5: The Manuscripts*, University of California Publications: Classical Studies 11 (Berkeley, 1975).

² Brief notices on the manuscript appear in the works of Georg Thilo, Gino Funaioli, and in John J. Savage, who provides descriptions of many of the Servian manuscripts. See *Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, ed. Georg Thilo and Hermann Hagen, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1881-1902), 1:lxvii-lxxviii; Gino Funaioli, *Esegesi Virgiliana Antica: Prolegomeni alla edizione del commento di Giunio Filargiro e di Tito Gallo* (Milan, 1930), p. 28; Savage, “The Manuscripts of Servius’s Commentary,” p. 188, and Savage, “The Scholia on Virgil’s *Eclogues* in Harleian 2782,” *Classical Philology* 24 (1929), 274-78.

³ Servius exists in two forms: the original or vulgate Servius written in the early fifth century by the grammarian Servius and the expanded version known as Servius Danielis (DS) after its first editor Pierre Daniel who published in 1600 what he thought to be the true Servius. The commentary known as Servius Danielis contains additional material as well as alterations and deletions. See George P. Goold, “Servius and the Helen Episode,” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 74 (1970), 105-17; Charles E. Murgia, “Why is the APA/Harvard Servius?: Editing Servius,” University of California eScholarship (Berkeley, 2004). <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/89p134jb> (5/3/14). Following Georg Thilo and Karl Barwick, Charles Murgia maintains that the anonymous compiler of Servius Danielis probably worked in the seventh century. C. Murgia, “The Servian Commentary on Aeneid 3 Revisited,” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 91 (1987), 303-31, at p. 303, n.1 argues “since errors received in its text of Servius reflect a minuscule tradition, its composition could hardly antedate the development of Insular minuscule.” See also Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1:lxviii-lxix and Karl Barwick, “Zur Serviusfrage,” *Philologus* 70 (1911), 106-45.

⁴ For the Bern scholia, see my discussion on pp. x-xx. John J. Savage, “The Manuscripts of Servius’s Commentary,” p. 188 states that Harley 2782 appears to transmit the “entire commentary of Servius.” For the *Georgics* and *Aeneid*, this is correct; for the *Eclogues*, a good portion of the vulgate Servius is furnished but not the entire commentary. Savage, “The Scholia on Virgil’s *Eclogues* in Harleian 2782,” p. 274 also remarks that notes on the *Eclogues* comprise excerpts from Servius interspersed with notes from redaction *b* of Philargyrius and some comments similar to those found in *Reginensis* 1495 as well as some new matter.

supplied extraneous non-Servian materials. This paper also demonstrates that the manuscript reflects wider trends found in other ninth- and tenth-century codices. It establishes how considerable attention was devoted to preserving the integrity of the Servian text, and it shows how scribes engaged with and interspersed Servius with other *scholia adespota* and, in the second codicological unit containing Servius on the *Eclogues*, with another commentary tradition. In addition, it argues that the very typicality of Harley 2782 is the key to its significance and provides insight into the Carolingian reception of Servius and the high status of the work in the ninth and tenth centuries. The Harley manuscript is chosen to exemplify Carolingian scholarly engagement with Servius precisely because it is so typical. To begin with, the manuscript originates in Northeast France, a crucial hub, as Silvia Ottaviano reminds us, of Vergilian scholarship in the ninth century.⁵ Harley 2782 encapsulates many ninth- and tenth-century trends: it transmits Servius as an independent text, intermingles Servius with occasional glosses, and, in the second codicological unit, combines Servius with another late antique commentary tradition. It bears witness to the Carolingian transmission and appropriation of late antique scholarship on Vergil and attests to the importance of Servius, the major late antique commentary on Vergil to survive both as glosses and as a separate work in the early medieval world.

That Servius was the focus of intense scholarly activity in the Carolingian age is hardly surprising since Servius was the most popular surviving ancient

⁵ Silvia Ottaviano, "Scholia non serviana nei manoscritti carolingi di Virgilio: prime notizie degli scavi," *Exemplaria Classica: Journal of Classical Philology* 17 (2013), 221-44, at p. 223.

commentary on Vergil and rapidly became a favourite.⁶ Probably finished in the first quarter of the fifth century, Servius was edited and augmented in the late antique period, activities that continued into the ninth century with the transmission of other late antique commentaries, new glosses, and ancillary materials copied alongside or intertwined with the Servian text.⁷ In addition, we know that Servius and his sources fed into key late antique and early medieval works, the most famous example being Isidore's highly influential *Etymologiae*.⁸ Isidore's heavy use of Servius has led one scholar to suggest that the *Etymologiae* may "represent another kind of *Servius auctus* not less important than the acknowledged one, the so-called Servius Danielinus."⁹ Moreover, Servius's sources, namely previous Vergilian commentaries, were incorporated into other works. Exploring the similarities and textual affinities between the late antique collection known as the *Scholia Veronensia* and the expanded version of Servius known as Servius Danielis, Claudio Baschera concluded that a common source must lie behind the two, and that this source was very likely an anthology which flowed into all kinds of other texts (e.g. *Liber glossarum*, *Abstrusa*, *Abolita*) and

⁶ *The Virgilian Tradition: The First Fifteen Hundred Years*, ed. Jan M. Ziolkowski and Michael C. J. Putnam (New Haven and London, 2008), p. 625.

⁷ For the date of Servius, see Giorgio Brugnoli, "Servio" in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 4 (1988), 805-13, at p. 805, and Charles Murgia, "The Dating of Servius Revisited," *Classical Philology* 98 (2003), 45-69. For a study of the complex array of material found in one ninth-century Vergil manuscript, see Silvia Ottaviano, "II Reg. lat. 1669," pp. 259-324. Ottaviano catalogues the various kinds of sources found in the manuscript, including Servius, as well as an astronomical miscellany drawn from Macrobius, Isidore, and Bede.

⁸ Servius was quoted by Priscian, used by Aldhelm, and mentioned by Alcuin. See Leighton D. Reynolds and Nigel G. Wilson, *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford, 1984), p. 385. For late antique and medieval scholars who drew on Vergil, see Max Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, 3 vols. (Munich, 1911-1931), 2:762-63.

⁹ Riccardo Scarcia, "Working Hypotheses on the Connection between Servius and Isidore of Seville," in *Servio: stratificazioni esegetiche e modelli culturali. Servius: Exegetical stratifications and cultural models*, ed. Sergio Casali and Fabio Stok, Collection Latomus 317 (Brussels, 2008), pp. 216-23, at 216.

included “the best of ancient commentaries on Virgil.”¹⁰ While Baschera’s findings contribute to a revision of the Rand theory, which suggested that Aelius Donatus was the source of the supplementary material in Servius Danielis,¹¹ they also posit a common pool of inherited sources which found their way into the augmented Servius and other important late antique and early medieval works.

Clues as to the transmission of Servius from late antiquity to the Middle Ages can be gleaned from surviving manuscripts.¹² Some kind of Insular influence seems clear though we cannot be sure whether that influence was due to Anglo-Saxon and Irish scribes working on the Continent or in their home countries.

Charles Beeson identified traces of an Insular transmission of Servius and of another late antique Vergilian commentary, that of Tiberius Claudius Donatus. He adduced as evidence palaeographical clues in extant manuscripts, namely Insular abbreviations and orthographical features.¹³ Further evidence is found in the form of glosses and names which corroborate some kind of Insular connection. For example, two Old Irish glosses were identified by Pierre-Yves Lambert in several

¹⁰ For the affinities between the *Scholia Veronensia* and Servius auctus, see Claudio Baschera, *Ipotesi d’una relazione tra il Servio Danielino e gli scolii veronesi a Virgilio*, Studi Filologici Veronesi 1 (Verona, 2000); C. Baschera, “Servius Danielinus and *Scholia Veronensia*,” in *Servio: stratificazioni esegetiche e modelli culturali*, pp. 207-15, at 213.

¹¹ Edward K. Rand, “Is Donatus’s Commentary on Virgil Lost?,” *The Classical Quarterly* 10, No. 3 (1916), 158-64. Rand’s thesis was questioned by David Daintree, “The Virgil Commentary of Aelius Donatus – Black Hole or Éminence Grise?,” *Greece and Rome*, Second series, 37, No.1 (1990), 65-79.

¹² Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 52 (saec. VIII/IX and IX^{med}, Corbie), which is extant in thirteen quires of which two date to ca. 850, provides important clues to the transmission of Servius and furnishes insight into one of three major traditions through which, according to Murgia, Servius can be constructed. The Leiden manuscript, apart from the two later quaternions, is a direct copy of δ, a symbol Murgia uses to denote a lost manuscript, through which three “pure descendants” survive, one of which is the Leiden codex. Murgia, *Prolegomena*, p. 82, argues that this exemplar was Continental and suggests that δ’s ancestor was written in a “scriptorium on the Continent and with Insular connections.” Thus, the exemplar behind Leiden 52, an important witness to Servius, appears to have been copied on the Continent.

¹³ Charles H. Beeson, “Insular Symptoms in the Commentaries on Vergil,” *Studi medievali* n.s. 5 (1932), 81-100.

Servian manuscripts.¹⁴ The occurrence of Old Irish glosses in another late antique Vergilian commentary, namely Iunius Philargyrius's *Explanatio in Bucolica Vergilii*, argues for an Irish contribution to the medieval reception of Vergil, as do the Irish name in the colophon of *Explanatio I*¹⁵ and the names of Irish masters found alongside Servius in a continental manuscript, Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 363 (saec. IX^{3/4}, St. Gall?).¹⁶ Surviving manuscript evidence demonstrates that Servius and Servius Danielis were known in Anglo-Saxon England by the eighth century. Servian material is found in an Isidorian epitome in a continental manuscript dated to ca. 800, the exemplar of which was copied in Anglo-Saxon minuscule.¹⁷ Knowledge of Servius Danielis is vouchsafed by a fragment of an English manuscript which was brought to the Continent and is perhaps linked with the mission of Boniface.¹⁸ This fragment, a bifolium dating to the early eighth

¹⁴ Pierre-Yves Lambert, "Les gloses celtiques aux commentaires de Virgile," *Études celtiques* 23 (1986), 81-128, at pp. 91-92.

¹⁵ The *Explanatio* survives in two recensions called I and II. According to Michael Herren and Brent Miles, the name "Fatosus" in the colophon of *Explanatio I* (Thilo & Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.2: 189, 15) is very likely "a latinization of the Irish name Toichthech." See Michael W. Herren, "Literary and Glossarial Evidence for the Study of Classical Mythology in Ireland A.D. 600-800," in *Text and Gloss: Studies in Insular Learning and Literature Presented to Joseph Donovan Pheifer*, ed. Helen Conrad-O'Briain, Anne Marie D'Arcy, and John Scattergood (Dublin, 1999), pp. 49-67, at p. 56; Brent Miles, *Heroic Saga and Classical Epic in Medieval Ireland*, *Studies in Celtic History* 30 (Cambridge, 2011), p. 28.

¹⁶ Bischoff, *Katalog I*, Nr. 585, p. 125 ascribes the manuscript to the circle of Sedulius Scottus. For a synopsis of recent scholarship on the Philargyrian commentary, see Miles, *Heroic Saga*, pp. 28-33. For discussion of the Bern manuscript, see John J. Contreni, "The Irish in the Western Carolingian Empire," in *Die Iren und Europa im früheren Mittelalter*, ed. Heinrich Löwe, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1982), 2:766-98. See also Miles, *Heroic Saga*, pp. 24-25. For a facsimile, see *Codex Bernensis 363 phototypice editus: Augustinus, Beda, Horatius, Ovidius, Servius, alii*, ed. Hermann Hagen, *Codices Graeci et Latini photographice depicti* 2 (Leiden, 1897). See also Simona Gavinelli, "Per un'enciclopedia carolingia (codice bernese 363)," *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 26 (1983), 1-25.

¹⁷ Michael Lapidge, "An Isidorian Epitome from Anglo-Saxon England," in *Anglo-Latin literature, 600-899*, ed. M. Lapidge (London, 1996), pp. 183-223. The Servian material in the epitome is not extensive enough to ascertain whether it was copied from Servius or Servius Danielis. See Miles, *Heroic Saga*, p. 26.

¹⁸ Marburg, Hessisches Staatsarchiv 319 Pfarrei Spangenberg Hr Nr. 1. See Lapidge, "Isidorian Epitome," pp. 183-223; Michael W. Herren, "The Transmission and Reception of Graeco-Roman Mythology in Anglo-Saxon England, 670-800," *Anglo-Saxon England* 27 (1998), 87-103, at p. 91. For a facsimile, see A. N. Doane and Tiffany J. Grade, *Deluxe and Illuminated Manuscripts Containing Technical and Literary texts*, *Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts in Microfiche Facsimile* 9 (New York, 2001).

century, transmits excerpts from a commentary on the *Aeneid* and a number of Old English glosses. Helen Conrad-O'Briain identified the text as Servius Danielis.¹⁹

By the ninth century, Servius's popularity on the Continent is abundantly evidenced in extant manuscripts. Servius survives in glossaries and Vergil glosses, and in florilegia of all kinds;²⁰ he is found in glosses to such works as Priscian and Martianus Capella, and he is himself glossed.²¹ Servius is sometimes copied in tironian notes or in a mixture of tironian notes and minuscule, as for instance, in the margins of the glossed Vergil manuscript, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. F. 2. 8 (saec. IX^{2/4}, Paris region).²² And very often, Servius is not simply copied but, as we shall see, scribes actively engage with the text. All this activity begs the

¹⁹ Helmut Gneuss, "Addenda and Corrigenda to the *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*," *Anglo-Saxon England* 32 (2003), 293-305, at p. 304. Gneuss notes that Helen Conrad-O'Briain "kindly informed me that this fragment comes from a book with selections from the augmented Servian commentary on the *Aeneid*, also known as *Servius Auctus*."

²⁰ For Vergil scholia in glossaries, see Wallace M. Lindsay, "Virgil Scholia in the Ansileubus Glossary," *The American Journal of Philology* 58, No. 1 (1937), 1-6. For a collection of glosses, see the glosses on the *Aeneid* 1-5 in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 11308, fols. 68r-113v. These glosses do not accompany the text of Vergil. According to Murgia, *Prolegomena*, p. 31 most of these glosses are similar neither to those in Servius nor in Servius Danielis, even though a small number derive from Servius and a few resemble those in Servius Danielis. Daniel Vallat, who transcribed the glosses on book 1 of the *Aeneid* in his article "Un Virgile pour débutants: les gloses du Parisinus Latinus 11308 (*Énéide* 1)," *Eruditio Antiqua* 2 (2010), 61-131, at p. 74 comes to the same conclusion as Murgia. Bischoff, *Katalog* 3, Nr. 4676, p. 172 states that the manuscript is probably from Northeast France and dates to the mid ninth century. For a florilegium which transmits, amongst other texts, some Servius, see John J. Contreni, *Codex Laudunensis 468: A Ninth-Century Guide to Virgil, Sedulius and the Liberal Arts*, *Armarius Codicum Insignium* 3 (Turnhout, 1984). Contreni provides an introduction to and facsimile of Laon 468.

²¹ For an example of the use of Servius in glossed Martianus manuscripts, see *Glossae aevi Carolini in libros I-II Martiani Capellae De Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, ed. Sinéad O'Sullivan, CCCM 237 (Turnhout, 2010), p. 318, 15. For the use of Servius in a Priscian manuscript, see e.g. the gloss on Priscian, *Institutiones* 2.68.10 on *acrisioneis dane*. Rijcklof Hofman, *The Sankt Gall Priscian Commentary: Part 1, Studien und Texte zur Keltologie* 1, 2 vols. (Münster, 1996), 1:208 and 2:398. Servius and other commentaries on Vergil are discussed in Hofman, *The Sankt Gall Priscian Commentary*, 1:70-73, § 4.5; all instances of the use of Servius and Vergil are listed in the index in Hofman, *The Sankt Gall Priscian Commentary*, 2:398-99. The gloss on *acrisioneis dane* draws on Servius's commentary on the *Aeneid* 7, 410 (Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 2:156). For further examples of Servius in the St. Gall Priscian, see Lambert, "Les gloses celtiques," p. 116. Servius is glossed, at times, in the vernacular. Old High German glosses occur in Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek Aug. perg. 116, fol. 6r, a Servian manuscript; Rolf Bergmann and Stefanie Stricker, *Katalog der althochdeutschen und altsächsischen Glossenhandschriften*, 6 vols. (Berlin, 2005), 2:677 date these to the tenth and eleventh centuries.

²² Bischoff, *Katalog* 2, Nr. 3771, p. 358.

following questions: why was there such interest in Servius and what made him so attractive to the Carolingian scholarly world?

Why Servius?

To begin with, Servius was popular because of the fundamental importance of Vergil, the Carolingian reception of whom is well attested by many surviving manuscripts.²³ According to Louis Holtz, forty-two Vergil manuscripts or fragments of the eighth and the ninth centuries survive, and most originate in France.²⁴ Many Vergil manuscripts are annotated; in fact, next to Priscian, Vergil is the most frequently glossed author in Carolingian manuscripts.²⁵ In addition, Robert Kaster demonstrates that for the *Aeneid* the ninth-century manuscripts maintained a high degree of consistency. He determines that “in over seven hundred places, the Carolingian manuscripts agree unanimously or nearly so in siding with one reading against another” and that the consensus of the Carolingian

²³ For the importance of the Carolingian manuscripts, see *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, ed. Roger A. B. Mynors (Oxford, 1969) which draws extensively on them. Gian B. Conte collated eight more Carolingian manuscripts in his edition *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis*, Bibliotheca Teubneriana (Berlin, 2009). Vergil is also found in library catalogues in the ninth century. See Birger Munk Olsen, “Les poètes classiques dans les écoles au IX^e siècle,” in *La réception de la littérature classique au Moyen Âge (IX^e-XII^e siècle): Choix d’articles publié par des collègues à l’occasion de son soixantième anniversaire* (Copenhagen, 1995), p. 35.

²⁴ For Carolingian Vergil manuscripts, see L. Holtz, “Les manuscrits latins à gloses,” pp. 160-66; L. Holtz, “La redécouverte de Virgile au VIII^e et IX^e siècles d’après les manuscrits conservés,” in *Lectures médiévales de Virgile: Actes du colloque organisé par l’École française de Rome* (Rome, 1982), ed. Jean-Yves Tilliette (Rome, 1985), pp. 9-30; L. Holtz, “Les manuscrits carolingiens de Virgile (X^e et XI^e siècles),” in *La fortuna di Virgilio: Atti del convegno internazionale* (Napoli 24-26 ottobre 1983), (Naples, 1986), pp. 127-49.

²⁵ David Ganz, “Carolingian Manuscripts with Substantial Glosses in Tironian Notes,” in *Mittelalterliche volkssprachige Glossen: Internationale Fachkonferenz des Zentrums für Mittelalterstudien der Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg*, ed. Rolf Bergmann, Elvira Glaser, and Claudine Moulin-Fankhänel, Germanistische Bibliothek 13 (Heidelberg, 2001), pp. 101-7, at 102. See also Mario Geymonat, “The Transmission of Virgil’s Works in Antiquity and the Middle Ages,” in *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*, ed. Nicholas Horsfall (Leiden, 2000), pp. 193-312, at 293.

books is maintained through correction.²⁶ Silvia Ottaviano corroborates these findings by demonstrating that many Carolingian manuscripts share significant conjunctive errors. She notes that this textual uniformity corresponds with a structural uniformity that characterises the manuscript tradition.²⁷ Vergil's importance is also evidenced by additions to older codices, such as the dry point glosses and tironian notes added around the middle of the ninth century to the Palatine Vergil.²⁸

Vergil's popularity in the Carolingian age did not emerge out of nowhere.²⁹ Many argue for direct knowledge of the poet in the pre-Carolingian period which is comparable to the direct knowledge of Vergil's commentators, especially Servius, as demonstrated above.³⁰ An important repository of antique tradition, Vergil was described by Macrobius as skilled in every discipline: "omnium

²⁶ Robert A. Kaster, *The Tradition of the Text of the Aeneid in the Ninth Century* (New York, 1990), pp. 65 and 144.

²⁷ See Silvia Ottaviano, "La tradizione delle opere di Virgilio tra IX e XI sec." (Ph.D. diss., University of Pisa, 2014), pp. 75-78.

²⁸ Michael McCormick, *Five Hundred Unknown Glosses from the Palatine Virgil (The Vatican Library MS. Pal. lat. 1631)*, Studi e Testi 343 (Vatican City, 1992). For the influence of the *antiquiores codices* in the Frankish world, see apart from this witness Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Vat. lat. 3867, both of which have Carolingian descendants. For the *antiquiores codices*, see Geymonat, "Transmission," pp. 293-312, at 305-6.

²⁹ The work of the Christian poets was important for the reception of Vergil. See Martin Irvine, *The Making of Textual Culture: "Grammatica" and Literary Theory, 350-1100*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 19 (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 364-70. For the reception of one such work in the Carolingian and Ottonian worlds, namely Prudentius's *Psychomachia*, see Sinéad O'Sullivan, *Early Medieval Glosses on Prudentius' "Psychomachia": The Weitz Tradition*, Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 31 (Leiden, 2004).

³⁰ For example, some scholars argue that there was direct knowledge of Vergil in early medieval Ireland. See especially Miles, "Classical Learning in Medieval Ireland: The State of the Question," in *Heroic Saga*, pp. 15-50, and Rijcklof Hofman, "Some New Facts Concerning the Knowledge of Vergil in Early Medieval Ireland," *Études celtiques* 25 (1988), 189-212. For Anglo-Saxon England, see Neil Wright, "Bede and Vergil," *Romanobarbarica* 6 (1981-1982), 361-79, who challenges the argument of Peter Hunter Blair that Bede's knowledge of Vergil was indirect and may have been gleaned through intermediary works, especially grammatical writings. See Peter Hunter Blair, "From Bede to Alcuin," in *Famulus Christi: Essays in Commemoration of the Thirteenth Centenary of the Birth of the Venerable Bede*, ed. Gerald Bonner (London, 1976), pp. 239-60.

disciplinarum peritus.”³¹ For Servius, Vergil was full of knowledge: “totus quidem Vergilius scientia plenus est.”³² And Vergil’s high status is demonstrated by imitation of his work in Carolingian court poetry.³³ He was also heavily cited by grammarians, e.g. by Priscian, in vogue in the ninth century.³⁴ Though speaking about a different time and place, Christopher Baswell’s observation about Vergil resonates with the Carolingian situation, namely that the poet was “revered as a master of Latin style in a culture where elegant Latinity was a gateway to political power.”³⁵ Moreover, in Vergil’s glorification of the Roman past and provision of a foundation myth of Rome, the poet was in tune with the socio-political and cultural ideals of the Carolingian world where the revival of the classical past had become normative. Though sometimes the focus of Carolingian *Angst* and Christian valorisation,³⁶ Vergil was also vigorously appropriated as a model of antiquity as illustrated by Carolingian efforts to transmit late antique commentaries on his work, especially that of Servius. The importance of antiquity and classical learning was extolled by figures such as Cassiodorus and Isidore who

³¹ *Saturnalia* 1.16.12, in *Macrobius: Saturnalia*, ed. Robert A. Kaster, Loeb Classical Library, 3 vols. (Cambridge, MA., 2011), 1:191.

³² Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 2:1, 1.

³³ See Peter Godman, *Poetry of the Carolingian Renaissance* (London, 1985).

³⁴ See Margaret Gibson, “Milestones in the Study of Priscian, circa 800-circa 1200,” *Viator* 23 (1992), 17-33; M. Gibson, “RAG. reads Priscian,” in *Charles the Bald: Court and Kingdom*, ed. Margaret Gibson and Janet Nelson with the assistance of David Ganz, BAR International Series 101 (Oxford, 1981), pp. 311-16; *Excerptiones de Prisciano*, ed. David W. Porter, Anglo-Saxon Texts 4 (Cambridge, 2002), pp. 15-19.

³⁵ Christopher Baswell, *Virgil in Medieval England: Figuring the “Aeneid” from the Twelfth Century to Chaucer* (Cambridge, 1995; repr. 1996), p. 1.

³⁶ Carolingian scholars at times rejected the pagan past and at other times embraced it. There is a well-established tradition for this. See Harold Hagendahl, *Latin Fathers and the Classics: A Study on the Apologists, Jerome and Other Christian Writers*, *Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia* 6 (Goteborg, 1958). A forthcoming article by David Ganz on “Charlemagne in the Margin” illustrates how in one heavily glossed ninth-century Vergil manuscript quite a number of the glosses transmit a Christian message.

saw it as essential for the “proper understanding of Christian culture.”³⁷ Hence Vergil, a model of antiquity, along with his most influential commentator, Servius, were crucial. In the Carolingian age, Servius was fundamental to understanding Vergil as attested by surviving manuscript witnesses where we find his commentary transmitted alongside the works of the poet. As Hendrikje Bakker notes: “Vergil and Servius are practically inseparable.”³⁸ Indeed, Vergilian manuscripts at times were deliberately laid out to contain Servius in the margins, as exemplified by the development of the “édition commentée”; in such “editions,” the text of Vergil is placed in the centre of the manuscript page and surrounded in the margins by well-ordered commentary in parallel columns often drawn from Servius.³⁹

So what specific aspects of the commentary of this late antique grammarian appealed to ninth- and tenth-century compilers?⁴⁰ To begin with, the format of Servius was a bonus, especially for glossators and compilers of glossaries. Proceeding word by word and line by line through Vergil’s works,⁴¹ Servius, as Don Fowler explains

³⁷ Malcolm B. Parkes, *Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West* (Aldershot, 1992), p. 21. See also Claudia di Sciacca, *Finding the Right words: Isidore’s ‘Synonyma’ in Anglo-Saxon England* (London, 2008), p. 8.

³⁸ Hendrikje A. Bakker, “*Totus quidem Vergilius scientia plenus est*: De glossen bij de vierde Ecloga en het zesde boek van de Aeneis (The glosses on the fourth Eclogue and the sixth book of the Aeneid),” (Ph.D diss., Utrecht university, 2007), pp. 383-85. See <http://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/23444>

³⁹ See Holtz, “Les manuscrits latins à gloses et à commentaires de l’Antiquité tardive à l’époque carolingienne,” pp. 154-59 and below, p. x.

⁴⁰ For the place of Servius in the long line of Vergilian commentary, see Don Fowler, “The Virgil Commentary of Servius,” *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, ed. Charles Martindale (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 73-78. And for a recent discussion of the man and his commentary, see Luca Cadili, “Scholia and Authorial Identity: The *Scholia Bernensia* on Vergil’s *Georgics* as *Servius auctus*,” in *Servio: stratificazioni esegetiche*, pp. 194-206, at 196-97.

⁴¹ Robert A. Kaster, *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1988), p. 170.

comes at the end of a long period of Virgilian commentary, which had begun in the first century BC. The commentary form itself goes back to Hellenistic and earlier Greek scholarship, above all on Homer, and in a sense Servius' work bears the same relationship to Homeric commentary as the *Aeneid* does to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The format is the familiar one of a lemma (one or more words of the text) followed by comments.⁴²

The process of selecting lemmata, referred to by Glenn Most as the "atomization" of a text, and furnishing these lemmata with explanations is important.⁴³ In the case of Servius, it resulted in ready-made chunks of commentary which could easily be mined for information. In the ninth and tenth centuries, Servius evidently served this purpose as demonstrated by excerpts from his commentary which occur as marginal and interlinear glosses on Vergil's poems. Servius's lemmatic commentary made it easy for medieval glossators to excerpt from his work. This Carolingian use of Servius, then, provides valuable insight into continuity with the classical commentary tradition, key aspects of which were at the heart of early medieval glossing practice. Servius, as James Zetzel demonstrates, attests to the importance of commentaries and scholia written in the period between the fourth and sixth centuries for the creation of medieval glosses.⁴⁴ In addition to quarrying Servius for glosses, Carolingian scribes preserved the integrity of his commentary as a separate text, itself an indication of his status.

⁴² Fowler, "The Virgil Commentary of Servius," p. 73.

⁴³ See Glenn W. Most, *The Measures of Praise: Structure and Function in Pindar's Second Pythian and Seventh Nemean Odes*, *Hypomnemata* 83 (Göttingen, 1985), pp. 34-35; Christina Shuttleworth Kraus, "Introduction: Reading Commentaries/Commentaries as Reading," in *The Classical Commentary: Histories, Practices, Theory*, ed. Roy K. Gibson and Christina Shuttleworth Kraus (Leiden, 2002), pp. 1-28, at 10-11.

⁴⁴ James E. G. Zetzel, "On the History of Latin Scholia," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 79 (1975), 335-54. An example is furnished by the Bobbio fragment of scholia on Juvenal in a ninth-century Juvenal manuscript known as the Pithoeanus. See James E. G. Zetzel, *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity* (Salem, 1981), p. 77.

Moreover, the linguistic, encyclopaedic, and antiquarian nature of Servius resonated with an early medieval audience:

More than half of his [Servius's] notes are concerned with linguistic problems: the meaning of difficult or unusual words, forms and constructions. Others name and clarify rhetorical figures. Only a third are non-linguistic. Many of these identify historical and literary allusions (Servius quotes frequently from classical authors such as Terence, Cicero, Sallust, Lucan, Statius, and Juvenal). Others explain philosophy, obsolete religious customs and historical context.⁴⁵

The linguistic elements were crucial. According to Luca Cadili, Servius provided a “demonstration of the skills of a *grammaticus*”⁴⁶ in that he furnished detailed grammatical interpretations and etymological exposition. This linguistic focus must have appealed to early medieval scholarly interest in etymology and language as can also be seen by the importance throughout the early Middle Ages of Isidore's *Etymologiae*, a work greatly indebted to Servius and concentrating on the origin and epistemic value of words.⁴⁷ Language is the largest category of comment in Servius and ties in with the importance of words in the early medieval period as attested, for example, by the transmission of glosses, glossaries, word lists, *glossae collectae*, and lexicons of all kinds. The linguistic focus was part of Servius's programme to elucidate Vergil's work.

⁴⁵ Ziolkowski and Putnam, *The Virgilian Tradition*, p. 630. For an example of the encyclopaedism of Carolingian scholars, see O'Sullivan, *Glossae aevi Carolini*, pp. xx-xxi.

⁴⁶ Cadili, “Scholia and Authorial Identity,” pp. 196-97.

⁴⁷ As an example of etymological interest, see the oldest gloss tradition on Martianus Capella where the text functioned, amongst other things, as a source of etymological and encyclopaedic information. See O'Sullivan, *Glossae aevi Carolini*, p. xx. See also Sinéad O'Sullivan, “Isidore in the Carolingian and Ottonian Worlds: Encyclopaedism and Etymology, c. 800-1050,” *Brill Companion to Isidore* (forthcoming).

Servius's encyclopaedism, based on the antiquarian principles of excerpting, collecting, and citing the works of authorities, clearly appealed to Carolingian compilers. In the ninth and tenth centuries his *variorum* commentary was recognised as a repository of classical authorities. Strong evidence exists that scribes paid attention to Servius's sources and to the plethora of authorities found in his commentary. In Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek Aug. perg. 116 (saec. IX/X, Reichenau?), the names of authorities cited by Servius are written in the margins.⁴⁸ The same is true of Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Sanc. Cruc. Plut. 22 sin. 1 (saec. IX^{2/3}, Tours):⁴⁹ on folio 4r, the names of Terence, Cicero, Horace, and Sallust are written in the right-hand margin of Servius. In Harley 2782, attention is also drawn to classical authorities.⁵⁰ By the ninth century, Servius himself was an authority whose name was cited by compilers. In Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS lat. 407 (saec. IX², Northeast France), a glossed Vergil

⁴⁸ On fol. 6r, the names of Cicero, Horace, and Sallust are copied beside passages in Servius which mention them (Horace appears twice). See Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1:25, 14-27. Murgia, *Prolegomena*, pp. 105-7 dates the marginal notes in the Karlsruhe manuscript to the tenth century. Savage (see reference below) argues that the script of the manuscript appears to be older than the tenth century. Murgia dates the manuscript to the ninth century. Alfred Holder and Rolf Bergmann date the manuscript to the tenth century. For descriptions of the manuscript, see Alfred Holder, *Die Handschriften der Großherzoglichen Badischen Hof- und Landesbibliothek in Karlsruhe V (Die Reichenauer Handschriften)*, Band 1: *Die Pergamenthandschriften* (Leipzig, 1906), pp. 298-99; Savage, "Servius's Commentary on Virgil," pp. 159-62; Bergmann and Stricker, *Katalog der althochdeutschen und altsächsischen Glossenhandschriften*, vol. 2, Nr. 299, p. 677-78. The manuscript has a number of Old High German glosses, which Bergmann and Stricker date to the tenth and eleventh centuries. The dialect of the glosses is Alemannian. A note of ownership of the seventeenth or eighteenth century on fol. 1r connects the manuscript with Reichenau.

⁴⁹ Savage, "Manuscripts of Servius's Commentary," p. 188 dates the manuscript to saec. IX/X; Murgia, *Prolegomena*, p. 37 revises the date to the second quarter of the ninth century. Bischoff, *Katalog* 1, Nr. 1242, p. 263 sees the manuscript as a product of Tours and dates it to the second third of the ninth century.

⁵⁰ *Nota* monograms occur beside passages which mention Varro, Pliny, Plautus, and Lucretius on fol. 93rv. And Terence is written in majuscules in the left-hand margin of fol. 8v.

manuscript, for example, the sources of the glosses are sometimes named, Servius among them.⁵¹

The linguistic, antiquarian, and encyclopaedic character of Servius furnished Carolingian compilers with a rich resource of material: from explanatory elucidations on metre and language to information on the ancient world's mythology, religion, history, places, heroes, gods, and emperors. Servius's function as a repository of antique information was crucial. Zetzel argues that Servius was part of a wider trend whereby the late antique commentaries, together with Isidore, formed "the basis of virtually all of the ancient knowledge now found in medieval marginalia."⁵²

The format, nature, and content of Servius help us to understand why his work was copied in the Carolingian age. For insight into the manner in which the Carolingians appropriated Servius I shall now focus on one Servian manuscript, Harley 2782, a standard Servian manuscript produced in the Frankish world.

Description of Harley 2782

(i) Foliation, measurements, date, and rubrication

fols. i + 181 + I; folio size 275 x 215 mm; written space 245-50 x 170-75mm; 49 lines.

On the basis of script, Savage posited a connection with the Tours scriptorium.⁵³ In

⁵¹ "SAEPE ... IMBVET AGNVS: Servius: imbuere est proprie inchoare et initiare. Nemo autem unam eandemque rem saepe inchoat. Sed constat saepe pascua mutare pastores. Unde necesse est pastores totiens aras imbuere, quotiens mutaverint Pascua" (*Eclogue* 1, 8; Valenciennes MS lat. 407, fol. 2r; Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1:6, 5-10). For a description of the Valenciennes manuscript, see Kaster, *Tradition*, p. 27. We know that its provenance was at St. Amand. Bischoff, *Katalog* 3, Nr. 6394, p. 400 locates it in Northeast France.

⁵² Zetzel, "On the History of Latin Scholia," p. 337.

⁵³ Savage, "Manuscripts of Servius's Commentary," p. 188. *A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts in the British Museum* (London, 1808), 2: 711 lists it as having been written in the ninth century.

consultation with Bernhard Bischoff, Murgia located the manuscript in Northeast France and dated it to the third or fourth quarter of the ninth century.⁵⁴ The manuscript is currently in a modern binding with modern foliation at the top of each folio. The folios have been trimmed at the top and bottom as well as in the margins, which causes occasional loss of marginal additions. There is very little rubrication, apart from fol. 147v7-9 which contains the *explicit* of Servius on *Aeneid* 10 and *incipit* of his commentary on book 11.

(ii) Quire description

Quire description is as follows: 1-5⁸ 6⁶ (wants 2 after fol. 41v and 5 after fol. 43v) 7⁸ 8⁸ (wants 3 after fol. 54v) 9-11⁸ 12⁶ (wants 5, 6 after fol. 87v) 13⁸ 14¹⁰ 15-17⁸ 18¹⁰ (wants 1 after fol. 129v) 19-20⁸ 21¹⁰ 22⁸ 23¹⁰ (wants 10 after fol. 181v).⁵⁵ In quire 1 (fols. 1-8), folio 7 is misplaced and should be second not seventh in the quire.⁵⁶ Quire 6 (fols. 41-44) misses sections of Servius (*Aeneid* 1, 339-82; 535-76). In quire 8 (fols. 53-59) a folio is missing between fols. 54v and 55r. Folio 54v ends with

⁵⁴ There is, however, no entry for the Harley manuscript in Bernhard Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen): Teil II: Laon-Paderborn (aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben von Birgit Ebersperger)*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für die Herausgabe der mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz (Wiesbaden, 2004). Murgia, *Prolegomena*, p. 37.

⁵⁵ $40 + 4 + 8 + 7 + 24 + 4 + 8 + 10 + 24 + 9 + 16 + 10 + 8 + 9 = 181$ folios.

⁵⁶ A section of Servius is missing between fols. 1v and 2r (*Georgics* 1, 25-51). The missing section is found on fol. 7 and is written in the same hand as the rest of the quire. Both folios 6 and 7 are singletons. Once rearranged, folio 7 would be the second leaf in the quire and would provide the missing section of the commentary between fols. 1v and 2r (*Georgics* 1, 25-51). The Servian text on fol. 1v ends with "uelis ter" (*Georgics* 1, 25) and starts again on fol. 2r with "gore. PATRIOS cultusque habitus" (*Georgics* 1, 51-52). Fol. 7r begins with "rarum. an maris, an caeli" (the letters "rarum" are part of the word "terrarium," the first letters of which are at the end of fol. 1v). Fol. 7v ends with "uel fri" (the letters "fri" are part of the word "frigore," the last letters of which are at the top of fol. 2r). By rearranging the leaves, the final words on fol. 6v: "efficit tempestates" (*Georgics* 1, 311) would now be followed by the correct words "sane sciendum" (*Georgics* 1, 311) on fol. 8r. The misplaced folio was not noted by Birger Munk Olsen in his collation who believed that there were ten leaves in the first quire with two missing leaves. See Birger Munk Olsen, "L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI^e et XII^e siècles," vol. 2 (Paris, 1985), p. 810.

Servius on *Aeneid* 2, 496 (“agri fluuiorum”) and folio 55r begins with comments on *Aeneid* 2, 601 (“filii cum Thebanis”). Quire signatures are found on fol. 33r (VII), fol. 45r (VIII), fol. 106r (XVII), and fol. 130r (XX). These signatures do not correspond to the current order of the manuscript’s quires.

(iii) Textual Affiliations

According to Murgia, Servius was transmitted through three main channels (Servius Danielis and two other traditions which he labels Δ and Γ . Murgia uses the symbol δ for a lost manuscript and Δ to “denote the tradition transmitted through δ ”).⁵⁷ Harley 2782 belongs to a subgroup of Servian manuscripts known as the “Tours group” (Savage uses the siglum β^2 and Murgia τ for this group).⁵⁸ Murgia states that manuscripts in τ “sometimes derive their basic text from Δ , sometimes from Γ ,” and can also transmit “interpolations from DS.”⁵⁹ He further observes that manuscripts in the Tours group generally derive from δ through an intermediary and are heavily contaminated from Γ , a fact unsurprising given that the majority of the extant Servian codices display contamination and interpolation.⁶⁰ The Tours family originates in France and derives its name from several of its oldest witnesses which appear to have been written at Tours or were influenced by the script of Tours, a well-known centre for the production of Vergil glosses.⁶¹ Savage attributes eighteen manuscripts to this group.⁶² The number of

⁵⁷ Murgia, *Prolegomena*, pp. 3-4.

⁵⁸ See Savage, “Manuscripts of Servius’s Commentary,” pp. 157-204; Murgia, *Prolegomena*, pp. 36-37.

⁵⁹ Murgia, *Prolegomena*, pp. 5-6.

⁶⁰ See Murgia, *Prolegomena*, p. 4. For interpolation and contamination in the Servian manuscripts, see Murgia, *Prolegomena*, pp. 86 and 141.

⁶¹ Murgia, *Prolegomena*, p. 36. Tours appears to have been a centre for the production of Vergil scholia. This is evidenced by Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 165, known as the Vergil of Tours, which is

surviving witnesses, some of which date to the early ninth century, makes the Tours family important for the transmission of Servius. Harley 2782, then, belongs to an influential family of Servian manuscripts that circulated early in Frankish centres and one that was central to the transmission of the text.

(iv) Content

Savage was the first to focus on the content of the commentary in Harley 2782, analysing a few of the notes on the *Eclogues*. Since then, however, there has been no further study of its content.⁶³ Harley 2782 transmits the complete vulgate Servius as an independent text with a commentary on the *Georgics* (fols. 1r-28r) and the *Aeneid* (fols. 28r-164v). That Servius was written as an independent work in Harley 2782 was not unusual and indeed is attested relatively early by surviving manuscripts such as the Corbie manuscript, Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, BPL 52 (dated VIII/IX and IX^{med}) and by two of the oldest witnesses of the Tours group, Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 7959 (saec. IX^{med}, Tours?) and Trier, Stadtbibliothek, MS 1086 (saec. IX, first or second quarter, Tours). Savage describes these manuscripts as “surviving examples of the high-class workmanship that went into the making of an edition of Servius ... in the first half of the ninth century.”⁶⁴

copiously annotated by many scribes. See John J. Savage, “The Scholia in the Virgil of Tours, Bernensis 165,” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 36 (1925), 91-164.

⁶² See Savage, “Manuscripts of Servius’s Commentary,” pp. 170-90.

⁶³ Savage, “Scholia on Virgil’s *Eclogues*,” pp. 274-78. Fol. 29r of the Harley manuscript has been published in Irvine, *The Making of Textual Culture*, p. 127, ill. 2.

⁶⁴ Savage, “The Manuscripts of Servius’s Commentary,” 170; Murgia, *Prolegomena*, p. 37. Bischoff, *Katalog* 3, Nr. 4516, p. 137; Nr. 6186, p. 377. Moreover, occasional lemmata and words in Servius are reduced to their initials by scribes in Harley 2782. In the following case, the reduction is comparable to similar abbreviated forms in the Vergilian lemmata: e.g. on fol. 29r38 the words “miscentes

For the *Eclogues* (fols. 165r-181v), the manuscript transmits a variorum commentary consisting of an amalgam of the vulgate Servius (incomplete) and notes from a collection known as the Bern scholia. The proportion of vulgate Servius and Bern scholia varies; at times the notes are predominantly from Servius, at other times they are mostly Bern scholia. Very often more than 50% of the vulgate Servius is present in the comments on the *Eclogues* and at times nearly 100%.

An *explicit* on fol. 164v, “Explicit expositio Seruii Grammatici in Bucolicon et libris Georgicon atque Aeneadum,” lists Servius’s commentaries in the commonplace order, and thereby suggests that at one stage Harley 2782 had a commentary on the *Eclogues* at the beginning of the manuscript. The fact that the ancient quire signatures do not correspond to the quires which now exist in the manuscript may also support the hypothesis that a commentary on the *Eclogues* once preceded those on the *Georgics* and *Aeneid*. The quire designated VII by the signature is currently the fifth, not the seventh. Two quires, then, appear to have been lost – just enough for Servius on the *Eclogues*. The manuscript, however, contains no further clues to support this hypothesis. The commentary on the *Georgics*, for instance, begins at the top line of fol. 1r and hence contains no signs that something (i.e. the remains of an *explicit* of *Eclogue* 10) originally preceded it.

The *explicit* to Servius’s works appears on the verso of the last folio of the *Aeneid*; the folio is worn, damaged, and partly empty indicating that it once was

nomen” are abbreviated to “m. n” (Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1: 8, 16; quotation from Lucan, *Bellum civile* 4, 10).

the last page of a booklet. Some of the empty space has been filled with a Mozarabic hymn.⁶⁵

(v) Codicological units

Harley 2782 comprises two codicological units (fols. 1-164, commentary on the *Georgics* and *Aeneid*; fols. 165-181, on the *Eclogues*). Many indications suggest that the commentary on the *Eclogues* was not originally part of the Harleian volume. Savage highlighted the fact that the opening and final pages of the commentary on the *Eclogues* are partly worn which seems to indicate that it once existed as a separate volume.⁶⁶ Henry Nettleship noted that the prefatory material prefixed to the commentary on the *Aeneid* on fol. 28rv is repeated, in part, at the start of the commentary on the *Eclogues* on fol. 165r.⁶⁷ This duplication is further proof that two different codicological units have been bound together. Other factors support the conclusions of Savage and Nettleship: the final pages of the commentary on the *Aeneid* are damaged, which suggests that it once marked the end of the manuscript; the commentaries on the *Georgics* and *Aeneid* are accompanied by *Z* notae and by words from Servius repeated in the margins, neither of which appear in the commentary on the *Eclogues*; the *NOTA* monograms in the first two commentaries differ from those in the last.⁶⁸ Moreover, unlike the commentaries on

⁶⁵ For which, see p. x.

⁶⁶ Savage, "The Manuscripts of Servius's Commentary," p. 188.

⁶⁷ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1:1, 1-2, 9. Henry Nettleship, *Ancient Lives of Vergil with an Essay on the Poems of Vergil* (Oxford, 1879), p. 5; Birger Munk Olsen, *L'étude*, p. 810 states that the manuscript comprises "2 éléments homogènes: f. 1-164 and f. 165-181."

⁶⁸ While very few marginal comments are found on the commentary on the *Eclogues*, the commentaries on the *Georgics* and *Aeneid* are accompanied by words from Servius repeated in the margins, together with some additional marginal material (glosses, corrections and headings)

the *Georgics* and *Aeneid*, the commentary on the *Eclogues* exists within its own quires. It has been written on one quire of eight leaves and another of ten leaves: 22⁸ (fols. 165-172) and 23¹⁰ (fols. 173-181, last leaf missing). By contrast, the transition between the commentaries on the *Georgics* and *Aeneid* takes place mid-folio on fol. 28r: no break in the form of a half empty folio separates the two commentaries and both are written by the same hand.⁶⁹ All this suggests that the commentary on the *Eclogues* was added later.

Additionally, the lemmata in the commentary on the *Eclogues* are generally not written in majuscules and are hard to distinguish from the comments.⁷⁰ A dot is usually all that distinguishes one comment from another. In the commentary on the *Georgics*, however, the lemmata are often in majuscules and in rustic capitals and there is occasional use of uncials. As for the lemmata in the commentary on the *Aeneid*, they are sometimes in majuscules and in rustic capitals and occasionally, for example on fol. 57v, in uncials and underlined.

That the existing commentary on the *Eclogues* was produced in the same milieu as the first codicological section seems clear since both codicological units display a link with Tours (see below, pp. x-xx), both are ruled in hardpoint for 49 lines per page, and both have *F* notae denoting mythological passages and use tironian *hic* to highlight passages of interest in the margins.

(vi) Principal Hands

written, for the most part, by contemporary hands. Some glosses copied by a later hand on fols. 24v-28r were also added to the commentary on the *Georgics*.

⁶⁹ The transition is marked as follows: "Explicit Liber Quartus. Incipit Liber Primus Aeneidos."

⁷⁰ An exception, for example, is on fol. 173r where some of the lemmata are in majuscules.

The principal hands in the manuscript furnish further evidence that the Harley manuscript comprises different codicological units. Hand A, the principal scribe copying the commentary on the *Georgics*, appears also in the commentary on the *Aeneid* but not on the *Eclogues*.⁷¹ He writes in Caroline minuscule in medium brown ink. The key features are as follows:

- *x* with long descender to the left
- heavy use of *e* caudatae
- very few ligatures (apart from *et* ligature)

Hand B, the principal contemporary or near-contemporary hand that copies the commentary on the *Eclogues* does not participate in the transcription of the commentaries on the *Georgics* and *Aeneid*.⁷² This supports the hypothesis that a later user supplemented a missing section after the main body of the text had been written. Hand B, writing in brown ink, uses a small, neat Caroline minuscule. The principal features are as follows:

- use of *st*, *nt*, *or* and *et* ligatures
- use of *e* caudatae
- *x* and *y* with long descender to the left
- rounded and upright *d*
- the tail of the *p* in the abbreviation for *pro* ends in a tiny hook⁷³

Hand B, moreover, may very well be among the hands that write some of the additional notes on the commentaries on the *Georgics* and *Aeneid* (a small neat

⁷¹ A number of hands copy the *Aeneid*, one of which is the same as the principal hand that copied the *Georgics*.

⁷² More than one hand copies the commentary on the *Eclogues*.

⁷³ See, for example, the word “proiecta” in Servius on fol. 176v32.

hand writing Caroline minuscule and using ligatures adds notes in the first codicological unit). If so, then hand B supplemented the work of hand A, but hand A never added to the work of hand B. This would support an argument that the commentary on the *Eclogues* was produced in the same scriptorium as those on the *Georgics* and *Aeneid*. In addition, a number of later hands working in the margins and writing in darker ink are found in the manuscript, for example on fol. 27v.

Hands A and B are the principal scribes of the *Georgics/Aeneid* and the *Eclogues* sections respectively, but at least two other scribes also write the main text, and at least three scribes engage in glossing and correcting.

Scribal Activity in Harley 2782

What makes Harley 2782 interesting is that considerable scribal attention was devoted to the copying and editing of Servius, as well as to the provision of supplementary material written in mostly contemporary but different hands (Z notae to indicate lacunae, marginally repeated words, *NOTA* monograms, headings, corrections, and occasional glosses).⁷⁴ In what follows I shall furnish details of these activities in order to demonstrate that Servius was treated as a text and that his commentary was the focus of considerable scribal attention.

The scribes' desire to provide complete and accurate commentaries on Vergil's works becomes evident from their filling lacunae, correcting errors, repeating words from and cross-referencing Servius, supplying variants to Servius,

⁷⁴ Headings are furnished in the margins in the commentary on the *Georgics*, e.g. on fol. 5v: "De v zonis": "brumalis," "australis," "septemtrionalis," "solstitialis," "aequinoctialis"; on fol. 8r: "De v. planetis."

identifying mythological passages, highlighting sections from the text, and expanding Servius with non-Servian materials.

(i) Filling lacunae

One method the scribes used to establish the integrity of the text was to fill in lacunae. In the commentaries on the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* of the Harleian codex, scribes used Z notae to indicate missing sections.⁷⁵ On fol. 4v32, for instance, we find the following text: "sane 'medicor' accusatium regit, ut 'medicor illam [rem]' figuratum est." A Z sign appears after "illam," and a corresponding Z sign in the left hand margin supplies the missing words: "medeor uero illi rei dicimus: nam medeor illam rem" so that the fully restored sentence now reads: "sane 'medicor' accusatium regit, ut 'medicor illam [rem]'; 'medeor' uero 'illi rei' dicimus: nam 'medeor illam rem' figuratum est."⁷⁶ In this instance, the reason for the omission, as in the second example below, appears to be haplography.⁷⁷ I provide two more passages from the Harleian Servius that are accompanied by Z notae which indicate that some text is missing; the missing text, which is here shown in angled brackets, is supplied in the manuscript's margin and is accompanied by Z notae:

⁷⁵ For instance, we find Z notae twice on fol. 9v. The position of the notae enables the reader correlate each nota to its corresponding text. To give an idea of the number of Z notae, we find roughly one per page on folios 2r-17v. Interestingly, Z notae are found in other manuscripts, for example, in manuscripts originating in Tours or belonging to the Tours family. For instance, in Trier MS 1086, Savage records the use of a similar sign (Z = ζῆται) to denote corruptions in the text. See Savage, "The Manuscripts of Servius's Commentary," p. 176. I found Z notae used in the Trier manuscript for missing sections of the text on folios 24r, 27v, 35r and 37v. Paris lat. 7959, another manuscript from the Tours family, uses Z notae to indicate lacunae (e.g. on fol. 181v to denote a missing section of text). Kathleen McNamee, *Annotations in Greek and Latin Texts from Egypt* (Oakville CT, 2007), p. 15, has demonstrated its use in papyri from Egypt. Moreover, Henry Mayr-Harting, "Augustine of Hippo, Chelles, and the Carolingian Renaissance: Cologne Cathedral Manuscript 63," *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 45 (2011), 51-75, at p. 55, found instances in an early ninth-century Chelles manuscript where *zetas* were not used to denote textual anomalies.

⁷⁶ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 176, 21-23, commenting on *Georgics* 1.193.

⁷⁷ I am grateful to the anonymous reader for underscoring that the reason for omission was often haplography and for indicating the instances in which this is the case.

Georgics 1, 431

Et sciendum, propria nomina femininum ex se tantum, <non etiam neutrum facere, ut "Foebus Foebē," "Iulius Iulia," "Tullius Tullia," non ut appellativum "doctus docta doctum">.⁷⁸

Georgics 2, 256

quod non procedit: tunc enim "r" in "s" mutatur, cum longa opus est syllaba, <ut "color coloros," "labor labos," "arbor arbos,"; hic autem non solum longam non facit syllabam>, sed etiam excluditur "s" cum superiori uocali.⁷⁹

In a few instances it is not just a section but a whole comment including the lemma that is supplied:

Georgics 1, 451

PROFVERIT MEMINISSE MAGIS ideo "magis," quia a sole uenientia uespertina signa meliora sunt.⁸⁰

Georgics 2, 67

ARDVA PALMA aut alta, aut ad quam difficile peruenitur.⁸¹

⁷⁸ Fol. 9v34; see Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 210, 24-27.

⁷⁹ Fol. 14r21; see Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 241, 30-242, 2. Further examples are, on fol. 17v, Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 269, 15-16: "Nam hoc dicit, omnes dies sic habet, ut festos putes. Alii dicunt festos"; on fol. 32v (Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1: 40, 17-18): "Quas nimfas esse non dubium est. Ideo autem nimfa eolo pollicetur, quia uentorum rex est"; on fol. 44v (Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1: 183, 6-7): "Quare non disco."

⁸⁰ Fol. 9v47; see Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 211, 19-20.

⁸¹ Fol. 11v32; see Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 224, 12-13.

Occasionally, a scribe filled in a lacuna and was corrected by another scribe. For example on fol. 50v33, words that are in Servius were not copied by scribe A either on account of a faulty exemplar or of eye-skip. The omitted words, indicated by brackets, are found at the bottom of the page and accompanied by a Z sign. These words are later emended by a second corrector: “quam ob causam. <et ad hoc respondit Sinon ‘ne recipi portis.’ Et est color, qui in amiecturali statu sepe requiritur. QVIS AVCTOR?> Ad hoc respondit”; this passage underscores the treachery of Sinon who persuaded the Trojans to admit a giant wooden horse into the city of Troy. A line appears under the letters “am” in “amiecturali” to indicate that it should be corrected. In Servius it is “coniecturali.” And the words “et est color” omitted by the first corrector are supplied by a second.⁸² Again this is a case of haplography.

Lacunae are also filled without recourse to Z notae. On fol. 2v12, for instance, the word “cibo” is added in the interlinear space;⁸³ on fol. 30v42, the word “hoc” is inserted between the words “in” and “nomine.”⁸⁴ On fol. 10r9 the text in angled brackets is supplied in the right hand margin beside the text word *Caesare*: “constat autem occiso Caesare <in senatu pridie iduum Ma<rt>iarum die solis fuisse defectum> ab hora sexta usque ad noctem.”⁸⁵ In this instance, the word *Caesare* happens to be the last word on line 9 and the comment is written directly next to it. Proximity to the text word *Caesare*, then, helps the reader know where to

⁸² Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1: 244, 13-15.

⁸³ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 152, 9.

⁸⁴ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1: 21, 25.

⁸⁵ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 212, 20-21. The word “Ma^{rt}iarum” should be emended to “Martiarum” as Caesar died on the Ides of March. I am grateful to the anonymous reader for pointing out this error in the edition of Servius and for drawing my attention to Servius’s elucidation here of a passage in *Georgics* 1, 466-68.

place the marginal comment. Referring to the murder of Caesar, Servius here comments on *Georgics* 1, 466-68:

ille etiam exstincto miseratus Caesare Romam,
cum caput obscura nitidum ferrugine textit
impiaque aeternam timuerunt saecula noctem

and mentions that a solar eclipse occurred the day before.

At times the Harley scribes deploy *signes de renvoi* in the text and in the margins in order to fill lacunae; on fol. 29v43, for instance the words in angled brackets, which had been omitted by the original scribe, are supplied at the bottom of the page and a *signe de renvoi* consisting of an *obelos* is used to indicate the missing section of the text: "Latinum. <sed uolens sibi fauorem Lacii conciliare nomen Latinum> non solum illis non sustulit, sed etiam Troianis imposuit." This is another case of haplography, here in a passage referring to the name of the Latin race and to the Trojans, the mythical ancestors of the Romans, and alluding to Aeneas's diplomatic skills.⁸⁶ At times, a corrector runs together a missing section from one comment with the lemma from another and provides a *signe de renvoi* in the form of an *obelos*, as on fol. 35r3: "DICTO <non antequam diceret, dixit enim 'haec ait'; sed citius, quam dici possit. PLACAT> sub poetica licentia physicam quoque tangit rationem. Mare enim dicitur esse Neptunus, quem superius dixit grauiter commotum, quia tempestas erat. Nunc agit 'placat', quia iam sedari coeperant maria"⁸⁷ and on fol. 41v14: "ERRANTEM <inuestigantem SVCCINCTAM>."⁸⁸

Both "PLACAT" and "SVCCINCTAM" are lemmata and do not correspond with the

⁸⁶ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1: 13, 2-3, on *Aeneid* 1, 6.

⁸⁷ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1: 61, 12-13, on *Aeneid* 1, 142.

⁸⁸ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1: 116, 16-19, on *Aeneid* 1, 322-23.

comments with which they are aligned. In the first example, two consecutive comments are conflated, that is, the scribe omitted text belonging to the lemma “DICTO” together with the lemma “PLACAT” belonging to a subsequent comment and instead aligned the lemma “DICTO” with comments to the lemma “PLACAT.”⁸⁹ In the second example, the comment on the lemma “ERRANTEM” and the lemma “SVCCINCTAM” are omitted by the scribe and are furnished by a corrector. The gloss on “SVCCINCTAM” is “instructam.”

Lacunae are occasionally indicated by a *signe de renvoi* in the form of two dots, for example on fol. 35r11 where a corrector supplies the words in pointed brackets in the right hand margin: “illi enim ‘parsi’ dicebant, <nos dicimus ‘peperci.’ Item nos dicimus ‘suscepi,’ illi> dicebant ‘suscepi’”; this is again a case of haplography, this time in a Servian comment on outmoded verbal forms.⁹⁰

In addition, words are sometimes crossed out and the omitted text is copied in the margins, as on fol. 72v43 where the words “aqua et est nuptiis” are crossed out and the lacuna is supplied in the left hand margin accompanied by a *signe de renvoi* in the form of a circle with a line through it: “<aqua et igni mariti uxores accipiebant unde hodieque et faces praelucent et aqua petita de puro fonte, interest nuptiis>”; in these lines Servius elucidates a passage in Vergil on the fires that bear witness to the union of Dido and Aeneas and comments on the link between fire, water, and weddings.⁹¹

⁸⁹ Sometimes scribes make no distinction between lemma and comment; in the commentary on the *Aeneid*, for instance, the lemmata are usually indistinguishable from the comments as on fols. 29r, 49r, and 154r.

⁹⁰ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1: 62, 5-6, on *Aeneid* 1, 144. The reading in Thilo and Hagen is: “illi dicebant succepi.” The scribe in the Harleian manuscript has thus made two errors.

⁹¹ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1: 493, 7-9, on *Aeneid* 4, 167.

(ii) Correcting errors

Scribes of Harley also corrected obvious errors in the Servian text. When the commentary as it stands was unintelligible, scribes evidently corrected it from a more authoritative version which happens to correspond to the majority of witnesses. On fol. 2r10, for instance, a scribe adds the letters “ce” to “praeferat” emending it to “praefererat”;⁹² on fol. 4r12, the words “quo artabis” are restored to “coartabis”;⁹³ on fol. 8r5, “dicens” is corrected to “dicimus”.⁹⁴ Even lemmata are corrected.⁹⁵

Moreover, the ancient critical sign, the *obelos*, is used to emend Servius. On fol. 80v15-18, a scribe repeats a number of lines from Servius (*Aeneid* 5, 52), which had previously been copied on fol. 80r31-34.⁹⁶ The duplicated section appears after the following Servian comment: “SANGVINE SACRO uictimarum, ut diximus supra” (*Aeneid* 5, 78).⁹⁷ In the left hand margin on fol. 80v, the *obelos* is placed beside the repeated section a number of times. We know that the *obelos* was used by the Alexandrian Zenodotus of Ephesus to denote doubtful passages in the Homeric text.⁹⁸ Together with a range of other critical signs developed by the Alexandrian

⁹² Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 147, 5, on *Georgics* 1, 57.

⁹³ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 169, 5, on *Georgics* 1, 157.

⁹⁴ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 199, 14, on *Georgics* 1, 314. On fol. 8r8, “laetantem” is corrected to “lactantem;” on fol. 8r45 “intra mundum” to “contra mundum;” on fol. 29r24, “ciuitatem” is corrected to “ciuitatum;” on fol. 31v28, “fluminum” is restored to “fulminum” (Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 199, 18, on *Georgics* 1, 315; 3.1: 202, 1, on *Georgics* 1, 337; 1: 7, 19-22, on *Aeneid* 1, 2; 1: 30, 21, on *Aeneid* 1, 42).

⁹⁵ For example, on fol. 32r33, “uerant” is changed to “uerrant” (Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1: 36, 15, comm. on *Aeneid* 1, 59); on fol. 4r33, the letters “el” are written in superscript over “SVPLEX” to render it “SVPELLEX”; Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 170, 19, on *Georgics* 1, 165.

⁹⁶ “VRBE MYCENE ... peryfrasis”; Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1: 596, 23-597, 2.

⁹⁷ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1: 601, 5.

⁹⁸ Francesca Schironi, “The Ambiguity of Signs: Critical σημεία from Zenodotus to Origen,” in *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters*, ed. Maren R. Niehoff (Leiden, 2012), pp. 87-112, at 89-90. For the use of signs, see especially Evina Steinova, “*Psalmos, notas, cantus*: On the meaning of *nota* in the Carolingian period,” *Speculum* 90/2 (2015), 424-57.

librarians, the *obelos* reached the medieval world through various channels, including Isidore.⁹⁹ In the Harley manuscript, it highlights a passage repeated unnecessarily and marks the passage for deletion, denoting an *athetesis*. As such, it follows Isidore's explanation of the term.¹⁰⁰

(iii) Repeating words in the margins

In contrast to the commentary on the *Eclogues*, in the commentaries on the *Georgics* and *Aeneid* an especially striking feature is the occasional repetition of words from Servius in the margins. This once again suggests that the commentary on the *Eclogues* was not originally part of the Harley manuscript. Lemmata and words of the commentary of Servius on the *Georgics* and *Aeneid* are sometimes singled out and written in the marginal space by hands that appear to be contemporary with the copying of the text.¹⁰¹ The distribution appears to create no discernible pattern in the Harley manuscript. The number of words singled out is relatively small (e.g. eight on folio 2r) and these marginal words are not copied close together. What is

⁹⁹ Ganz, *Corbie*, pp. 68-69.

¹⁰⁰ Isidore, *Etymologiae* 1.21.3; *The "Etymologies" of Isidore of Seville*, tr. Stephen A. Barney, W. J. Lewis, Jennifer A. Beach, and Oliver Berghof (Cambridge, 2002), p. 50: "The *obelus*, that is, a horizontal stroke, is placed next to words or sentences repeated unnecessarily, or by places where some passage is marked as false."

¹⁰¹ For example, the following words are found on fol. 1r: "fimus" (Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 129, 21), "alma," and "ceres" (Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 131, 8). On fol. 2r, we find "crocum," "sabaei," "tus," "calybs," "castores," "epyros," "sub," and "nouales" (Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 147, 1-150, 9); on fol. 2v, "laetus," "quisquilias," "rostrum," and "ceres" (Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 151, 1-154, 18); on fol. 3v, "ueternum," "uirus," and "pliadas" (Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 162, 5-164, 17); on fol. 4r, "rubigo," "uomis," "supellex," "uannus," "buris," and "stiuā" (Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 168, 1-172, 20); on fol. 36r, "scopulus" and "agmen" (Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1: 72, 13-75, 3); on fol. 37v, "despiciens" and "suspiciens" (Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1: 85, 23); on fol. 113v, "agmina," "patriis," and "pulcro" (Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 2: 176, 17-177, 3). On fol. 120r, the following lemmata were written in majuscules: "FELLE" and "SILEX" (Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 2: 229, 23; 231, 5). The words are not written by the text hands. There are a number of correctors, one of whom writes in a dark brown ink, as well as some later additions in the margins, especially in the commentary on the *Aeneid*.

noteworthy, however, is that other ninth- and tenth-century Servian manuscripts transmit words in the margins and indeed many of the same marginally repeated words. In Karlsruhe 116, for instance, the following items are highlighted: authorities, as well as Greek words and rhetorical terms.¹⁰² And interestingly, a number of the same words are singled out in the Karlsruhe and Harley manuscripts, suggesting perhaps that the words were not randomly selected.¹⁰³ We can only guess at the function of such words. Perhaps they enabled compilers to extract material more readily or served as an aid to the reader, facilitating navigation of such a large work. What is noteworthy is that the provision of marginally repeated words was not unique to Servian manuscripts and the same words were often selected in different witnesses.¹⁰⁴

(iv) Cross-referencing

In the Harley manuscript, scribes also cross-referenced material. On fol. 22v, for example, we find a gloss on Servius's comment on *Georgics* 3, 389 referring the reader to Servius's comment on *Aeneid* 10, 473 where we find the same verb "Reice: reice de hoc in libro x plenius inuenies Aeneidorum ad simile signum." The comment is accompanied in the left-hand margin with a *signe de renvoi* which is very similar to the *signe de renvoi* found beside Servius's comment on *Aeneid* 10,

¹⁰² On fol. 36r, two Greek words are written in the margin; on fols. 36v and 47r, rhetorical terms are singled out. Similarly, in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 7959, rhetorical terms are underscored, for example, on fol. 42r. The same is true of Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 22 sin. 1 on fol. 5v and fol. 15r, and of Leiden BPL 52 on fol. 16r, as well as of Harley 2782 on fol. 41r, fol. 90v, and fol. 106r.

¹⁰³ On fol. 30rv, the following words are present in the margins of the Karlsruhe manuscript: "tus," "calybs," "testones," "castores," "sub," "nouales et noualia," corresponding to the same marginal entries in Harley 2782, fol. 2r.

¹⁰⁴ A marginal index occurs in Cicero's *Cato Maior* in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS nouv.acq. lat. 454 where we find an index of names. See Ganz, *Corbie*, p. 78.

473 on fol. 143v³⁸ (the left-hand margin has been cut on fol. 143v and hence only part of the *signe de renvoi* has survived).¹⁰⁵ The practice of cross-referencing appears in other Vergil manuscripts in glosses on the text of the poet.¹⁰⁶

(v) Supplying variants

Servius is also sometimes supplied with variants, once again indicating the care scribes expended on the Servian text. On fol. 1v5-7, for instance, “uel facultatem” is supplied by a different scribe in the interlinear space, a variant not attested in Thilo and Hagen’s edition of Servius: “FERTE SIMVL FAVNIQVE P.: ‘Pedem ferte’ aut simul uenite, aut date carmini meo facilitatem **uel facultatem**, quod utique pedibus continetur, ut sit ‘ferte pedem’ metricam prestate rationem.”¹⁰⁷

(vi) Identifying mythological passages

The margins in Harley 2782 were sometimes used to identify mythological passages in Servius who often explained the mythological allusions in Vergil. That scribes should draw attention to this is hardly surprising given the Carolingian interest in pagan mythology as attested, for instance, by glosses on writers such as Martianus Capella.¹⁰⁸ A relatively high percentage of the mythological passages in Servius are accompanied in the margins by letters indicating their content. In

¹⁰⁵ For the verb “reicio,” see J. F. Mountford and J. T. Schultz, *Index rerum et nominum in Scholiis Servii et Aelii Donati Tractatorum*, Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 23 (Ithaca, N.Y., 1930), p. 144.

¹⁰⁶ For example, it is found in the ninth-century Vergil manuscript, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. F. 2. 8.

¹⁰⁷ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 133, 7-9.

¹⁰⁸ See Sinéad O’Sullivan, “Obscurity, Pagan Lore and Secrecy in Glosses on Books I-II from the Oldest Gloss Tradition,” in *Carolingian Scholarship and Martianus Capella: Ninth-Century Commentary Traditions on Martianus’ “De nuptiis” in Context*, ed. Mariken Teeuwen and Sinéad O’Sullivan, *Cultural Encounters in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* 12 (Turnhout, 2011), pp. 99-121.

Harley 2782, the letters “F,” “Fa,” “FAB,” and “FB” occur in the marginal space (e.g. on fols. 20r, 21r, and 100v) and very often when the word *fabula* is found in Servius. Similar abbreviations are attested in many Servian manuscripts. That the letters “F,” “Fa,” “FAB,” and “FB” stand for “fabula” is clear from the accompanying Servian passages and from the correlation of variations of these letters with “fabula” in a number of manuscripts, for instance, in Paris lat. 7959 (fols. 7v and 189v), Florence, Plut. 22 sin. 1 (fol. 22r), and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 7962 (fols. 8v and 11r).¹⁰⁹ Since these letters also occur in Leiden 52 and we can date the additions in the Leiden manuscript to the early ninth century, scribes clearly began to draw attention to the mythological material in Servius relatively early.¹¹⁰ Interestingly, the letter “F,” used to denote “fabula” in Harley 2782, appears besides many of the same mythological passages in Trier, Stadtbibliothek, MS 1086 (T) (saec. IX^{1 or 2}, Tours), a manuscript, which, as we shall see, is related to the Harley codex.¹¹¹ Above all, the appearance of the letters “F,” “Fa,” “FAB,” and “FB” to denote “fabula” in the margins of the Harley manuscript attests to an interest in the mythological lore of Servius and underscores a wider Carolingian interest in classical lore and the use of Servius to understand the pagan mythology in Vergil.

¹⁰⁹ Murgia, *Prolegomena*, p. 37 dates Paris MS lat. 7962 to the first quarter of the ninth century. Bischoff, *Katalog* 3, Nr. 4518, p. 137 dates it to the first or second quarter of the ninth century and locates it in the Paris region. The word *fabula* is generally accompanied by the genitive of a proper name specifying the protagonist(s) in various summaries of fables occurs in the margins of Servian manuscripts: in the Karlsruhe codex as “Fab. Phillidis” on fol. 13r, “F. Philomaelae” on fol. 18r, “fabula Neptuni et Mineruae” on fol. 27r and “Fab. Priapi et Loti” on fol. 45v; in the Leiden manuscript as “fabula de aureo ramo” on fol. 23r; in Trier MS 1086 as “F. Amphionis et Zeti” and “F. Daphnis” on fol. 2r; in Paris lat. 7959 as “fab. Erictoni” on fol. 50v; in the Florentine manuscript as “FA” alongside a comment on Proserpina and Pluto on fol. 16r; in Bern MS 363 as “Fab” beside a note on Pallas on fol. 8v.

¹¹⁰ For the date of the annotations in the Leiden manuscript, see Ganz, *Corbie*, p. 74.

¹¹¹ For instance, many of the notes marking mythological passages on fol. 168r, fol. 173r, and fol. 175r in the Harley manuscript are matched by those on fol. 2r, fol. 6v and fol. 8v in T.

(vii) Highlighting passages

Additionally, the margins of Harley 2782 were used to highlight passages in Servius, as illustrated by the abundance of *NOTA* monograms in various forms: in the commentaries on the *Georgics* and *Aeneid* as *NT* in ligature (*T* above the *N*) with an *o* in between and as *NT* in ligature;¹¹² in the commentary on the *Aeneid*, as capital *N* with an *o* above and as capital *NOTA*. The *NOTA* monograms in the commentary on the *Eclogues* are different: here *NT* appears in ligature with *o* to the left and *a* to the right; *NT* in ligature with *o* underneath and *a* to the right; capital *N* with *o* to the right. The differences in the *NOTA* monograms reconfirm that this part of the codex is a separate codicological unit.

As for the function of these monograms, all manner of things are highlighted. For example, the opening comments of *Eclogue* 4, 1-10 are marginally distinguished with a *NOTA* on fol. 171v21. The commentary provides, amongst other things, a Christian interpretation of *Eclogue* 4. So too the allegorical meaning of *Eclogue* 6 is marked with a *NOTA* on fol. 174r29. Servius's comments on various kinds of farming equipment on *Georgics* 1, 164 are highlighted for attention on fol. 4r29. In the Harley manuscript, we sometimes find *NOTA* monograms beside Servian passages which cite authorities such as Pliny, Varro and Lucretius (e.g. on fols. 92v-93v).

¹¹² Both forms are attested in other Carolingian Servian manuscripts. The former appears frequently in Paris lat. 7962 (e.g. on fols. 3r and 5r); the latter in Karlsruhe 116 (e.g. on fol. 92v) and Paris lat. 7959 (e.g. on fols. 9v, 14r and 24r).

So what can we say about the function of these monograms? Generally, they appear to serve as a kind of *Nota Bene*.¹¹³ In some codices, monograms are occasionally deployed alongside a lengthy passage in Servius, as in Karlsruhe 116, where on fol. 92r the letters *NOTA* are stretched over nine lines. Similarly in Harley 2782 on fol. 68v21-27, a *NOT* monogram occurs beside seven lines of text.¹¹⁴ And we find monograms accompanied by glosses in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 12132 (saec. IX^{3/4}, Rheims).¹¹⁵ Whilst it is difficult to establish with certainty that the monograms in the Harley manuscript served a specific function, they nevertheless reflect the well-attested scholarly interest in highlighting passages in Servius as also evidenced by other Carolingian Servian manuscripts. A fascinating example of this interest is furnished by Bern MS 363 (saec. IX; see p. x, fn. 16); in this manuscript attention is drawn to sections in

¹¹³ Tironian *hic* seems to be used for a similar purpose, as does the Chi-Rho symbol. For instance, Tironian *hic* is found on fol. 54r, fol. 78r, and on fol. 178r. We also find Tironian *hic* in other Servian manuscripts, e.g. on fol. 27v of Paris lat. 7962; fol. 39v of Trier, Stadtbibliothek MS 1086; and fol. 19v of Leiden BPL 52. The Chi-Rho symbol appears on fols. 58v, 71v, 72r, 73r in the Harley manuscript. It also appears in other Carolingian manuscripts. For the use of the Chi-Rho symbol by a female scribe in a copy of Augustine on the Psalms, see Mayr-Harting, "Augustine of Hippo," p. 54. Additionally, scribes in Harley 2782 furnished *q* notae, which dot the margins of the commentary on the *Aeneid* (e.g. on fols. 31r, 43r, 103v, 150v). These notae are also found throughout Bern MS 363. See Hagen, *Codex Bernensis 363 phototypice editus*, pp. xxxvii-xxxviii; Contreni, "The Irish in the Western Carolingian Empire," p. 773. For debate surrounding the function of *q* notae, see Gernot Wieland, "The Glossed Manuscript: Classbook or Library Book?," *Anglo-Saxon England* 14 (1985), 153-73, at pp. 167-70, and John F. Petruccione, "The *Q*;, *Quare Hoc* and *Ad Quid* Glosses: Observations on their Purpose and Distribution," *Scriptorium* 62 (2008), 231-51.

¹¹⁴ In other manuscripts, we have besides at least one interesting example of how such monograms were used. David Ganz, *Corbie*, pp. 68-80, has identified a hand which employs a *NOT* monogram in Corbie manuscripts often found alongside texts referring explicitly to the eucharist and predestination. In addition, he discovered excerpting marks beside passages in texts which were quoted by Ratramnus. Cumulatively, the marks and monograms appear to furnish insight into the working practices of theologians such as Ratramnus at Corbie.

¹¹⁵ See Marie-Pierre Laffitte and Charlotte Denoël, *Trésors carolingiens: Livres manuscrits de Charlemagne à Charles le Chauve* (Paris, 2007), pp. 178-79; Bischoff, *Katalog* 3, Nr. 4735, p. 183. According to Laffitte and Denoël, the glosses are the autograph glosses of Hincmar and "prouvent que l'Archevêque de Reims a soigneusement lu le texte pour l'utiliser dans ses propres écrits, et en particulier dans sa réponse au moine d'Orbais Gottschalk, *De una et non trina deitate*, écrite en 860." However, at a conference in Den Haag in 2014 David Ganz urged caution in attributing the glosses and monograms to Hincmar.

Servius which are marked by marginal references to Irish masters (e.g. John Scottus Eriugena and Sedulius Scottus) and continental writers (e.g. Godescalc and Ratramnus).¹¹⁶ These references demonstrate that passages in Servius were singled out and aligned with other sources.

Adding non-Servian material

(i) Additional material other than the Bern scholia

Further evidence that the scribes of Harley 2782 actively engaged with Servius is found in efforts to augment Servius and, particularly in the second codicological unit, to intertwine his commentary with non-Servian interpolations. Such efforts, moreover, tie in with the history of Servius as an open text.¹¹⁷ In the commentaries on the *Georgics* and *Aeneid* the additional material is furnished as marginal and interlinear annotations which are not intertwined with Servius but are often linked to it by placement, *signes de renvoi*, or Z notae. On fol. 2v, for instance, a comment has been entered at the top of the page explaining a technical term denoting a figure of speech in Servius.¹¹⁸ It is joined to its lemma by means of a Z sign. Servius comments on the following lines from *Georgics* 1, 84-85 about the tender halm: “saepe etiam incendere steriles profuit agros,/ atque leuem stipulam crepitantibus urere flammis.” Servius adds as a comment on “leuem stipulam” that this is a case of “*ecbasis poetica*” (poetical digression or superfluity) since “halms” are always

¹¹⁶ Contreni, “The Irish in the western Carolingian empire,” pp. 766-98, demonstrates that in some instances these references seem to reflect Carolingian theological debate; in others, they create links between the work of Servius and contemporary writings.

¹¹⁷ For Servius as an open text, see Luca Cadili, “Scholia and Authorial Identity: The *Scholia Bernensia* on Vergil’s *Georgics* as *Servius auctus*,” in *Servio: stratificazioni esegetiche e modelli culturali*, p. 197.

¹¹⁸ The anonymous reader very kindly pointed out the full significance of this comment on a passage in the *Georgics* and provided the references in n. 144.

“tender.” “Ecbasis,” itself a Greek loanword, is somewhat rare: TLL lists six instances only, of which five occur in Servius.¹¹⁹ And yet the word was understood correctly in the Carolingian world, as is clear from the marginal comment in Harley: “id est superflua uerbi repetitio. Nam stipula per se leuitatem significat, unde leues stipulas diximus.” The comment bears striking resemblance to a note found in two manuscripts belonging to the Tours family: Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. 52 in scrinio (saec. IX^{2/4}, Saint Germain des Prés?) and Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Reg. lat. 1495 (saec. X, prov. Rheims).¹²⁰ This is in line with what Savage observed: he pointed out that supplementary material “characteristic of *Regin.* 1495” appears in the Harleian codex.¹²¹ This is not surprising. Even the most cursory examination of glosses in ninth- and tenth-century Vergil manuscripts indicates that the additions in the *Reginensis* were not unique.¹²² How did the Carolingian commentators, then, know

¹¹⁹ TLL, s.v. “ecbasis” gives the definition “id quod digressio,” and lists the following occurrences: Servius, *Georgics* 1, 85; 1, 322; 2, 209; 3, 161; *Aeneid* 11, 724, as well as one instance in *Schol. Hor., app. carm.*, 1, 23, 5. See also Mountford and Schultz, *Index*, p. 57. According to the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, s.v. “ἐκβάσις” the word is not attested in Greek literature in the sense in which it is used by Servius. One may further note that the word is nowhere found in the Latin grammarians; see <http://kaali.linguist.jussieu.fr/CGL/>.

¹²⁰ For the Hamburg manuscript, see Murgia, *Prolegomena*, p. 37; Bischoff, *Katalog* 1, Nr. 1494, p. 311. The note is found in the critical apparatus in Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 153, 12. It is linked to the vulgate Servius by means of a Z sign which also appears in the Servian text beside the words “ecbasis poetica.” The Vatican manuscript contains an expanded version of Servius’s commentary copied in the tenth century, the origin of which is unclear. Ottaviano, “II Reg. lat. 1669,” p. 288 gives Rheims as its provenance.

¹²¹ Savage, “The Manuscripts of Servius’s Commentary,” p. 188. Reg. lat. 1495 transmits supplementary material to the commentary of Servius which is included in the critical appendix of Thilo’s edition. For these interpolations, see also Stefano Poletti, “La tradizione delle interpolazioni a Servio tipiche del Reg. lat. 1495,” in *‘Totus scientia plenus’: Percorsi dell’esegesi Virgiliana antica*, ed. Fabio Stok (Pisa, 2013), pp. 257-92.

¹²² Ottaviano, “II Reg. lat. 1669,” pp. 288-93, for instance, uncovers non-Servian material in Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Reg. lat. 1669 which coincides with that in Reg. lat. 1495. Savage, “The Scholia in the Virgil of Tours, Bernensis 165,” pp. 91-164 discovers glosses similar to the additional material in Reg. lat. 1495 in Bern, Burgerbibliothek MS 165. Another example of a manuscript with additions similar to Reg. lat. 1495 is Montpellier, Bibliothèque interuniversitaire, Section Médecine, H 253. In the commentary on *Eclogue* 7, 61, fol. 12v, “Alcide: patronomicum” appears as an interlinear gloss. This gloss is not in Servius, Servius Danielis, *Scholia*

what this relatively rare word means? In only two of the other instances in Servius is there a clue to its significance: in his comment on *Aeneid* 11, 724 he writes: “ecbasis .i. excessus”; and in his comment on *Georgics* 3, 161 he writes: “ecbasis poetica: suffecerat enim ‘aut scindere terram,’”¹²³ a reference to *Georgics* 3, 160, which in sense overlaps with the meaning of *Georgics* 3, 161. Since neither of these two scholia provides the explanation that is found in the Harley manuscript, we may conclude that Carolingian scholars must have had access to another, as yet unidentified, source.

The supplementary notes that appear in Reg. lat. 1495, however, are not the only material added to Servius in Harley 2782. On fol. 30r, the following is written in the margin: “aliter et Erini et Adlecto et Chimera est” and is linked on fol. 30r32 by a *signe de renvoi* to the words in Servius “ubi sunt Furiae.”¹²⁴ This marginal variant is almost identical to a comment in Hamburg Cod. 52 and a similar reading is found in two other witnesses.¹²⁵

Sometimes Servius is glossed with contemporary interlinear or marginal annotations. These are usually short and often furnish lexical equivalents, grammatical information, or etymological explanations. Some examples are:

fol. 2r10: PRAEFECERAT ordinauerat¹²⁶

fol. 2v10: VIRIBVS ablatiuus¹²⁷

fol. 2v11: FRUMENTIS datiuus; EXEQVANTVR assimilantur¹²⁸

Bernensia, *Scholia Veronensia*, nor the Philargyrian commentary. There are, however, similarities with Reg. lat. 1495. See the critical apparatus in Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 91.

¹²³ See Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 291, 7-8.

¹²⁴ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1: 16, 8.

¹²⁵ “Vbi sunt Furiae aliter et erini et allecto vel cembra est.” For similar variants, see the critical apparatus in Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1: 16, 8.

¹²⁶ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 147, 5.

¹²⁷ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 152, 2.

fol. 4v13: ANTISTOECHON id est per contrariam litterarum immutationem¹²⁹

fol. 8r14: STIPVLAE a stipando dictae¹³⁰

fol. 12v38: SAEVAE NOVERCAE nam nouerca non est nomen criminis sed necessitudinis¹³¹

fol. 17r2: OBSTITERIT obuiauert¹³²

fol. 36r36: AVDITORIVM id est scola¹³³

(ii) Bern Scholia

In the commentary on the *Georgics*, we find a few notes from the so-called Bern scholia. On fol. 12r, for instance, the addition, “Eo quod ad similitudinem testiculorum sint humanorum” is linked by a *signe de renvoi* to the corresponding Servian passage on fol. 12r8: “HORCADES a greca ethimologia, sed obscena, id est a testiculis.”¹³⁴ Commenting on the Greek loanword *orchas* (ὄρχας = a kind of olive), the additional note further elucidates Servius’s comment adding that this olive resembles human testicles. The note is closest to the Bern scholia.¹³⁵ On the same

¹²⁸ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 152, 3.

¹²⁹ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 174, 21.

¹³⁰ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 200, 4.

¹³¹ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 231, 16.

¹³² Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 263, 28.

¹³³ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 1: 74, 15.

¹³⁴ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 226, 1-2.

¹³⁵ *Scholia Bernensia ad Vergili Bucolica atque Georgica*, ed. Hermann Hagen, *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, Supplementband 4 (Leipzig, 1867; rpt. Hildesheim, 1967), p. 893: “ORCHADES a similitudine testiculorum dictae, quos Graeci OPXEIΣ appellant.” See also the *Brevis expositio* in Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.2: 290, 3-4: “ORCADES insulae XXX iuxta Graecam etymologiam, sed obscenam dictae in modum testiculorum. Nam Graece ὄρχεις id est testiculi dicuntur.” For mention of the Orkneys in Servius, see his commentary on *Georgics* 1, 30 in Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 139, 10. See also Mountford and Schultz, *Index*, p. 123.

page another comment, similar to the Bern scholia, appears in the margin accompanied by a Z nota and is linked to the text.¹³⁶

The additions in the Harley commentary on the *Eclogues* provide insight into the accretive nature of commentary traditions. Here they are not furnished as supplementary material in the form of annotations but are intertwined with Servius. The result is a mixture of vulgate Servius with notes from the Bern scholia, a mixture which displays close affinities with specific manuscripts. Savage states that a large number of notes in Harley 2782 stem from “redaction *b* of Philargyrius.” These notes belong to the Bern scholia, a collection of glosses on the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* which derives its name from two manuscripts now housed in Bern.¹³⁷ The Bern scholia are closely related to two other commentaries, the *Explanationes in Bucolica Vergilii* of Iunius Philargyrius (extant in two recensions) and the *Brevis Expositio* on the first and part of the second book of the *Georgics*.¹³⁸ Gino Funaioli referred to all three as the scholia of Philargyrius after the late antique grammarian upon whose work the commentaries were based.¹³⁹ He

¹³⁶ “Latine: lepus inde sic dicta quia currit ad maturitatem celeriter.” See the Bern scholia in Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia*, p. 893: “TENUIS uel quod cito ad maturitatem currit uel quod tenue et gracile facit uinum”; and the *Brevis expositio* in Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.2: 291, 14: “VTILIOR ad maturitatem cito currit et gracile vinum facit.” The passage in Servius comments on *Georgics* 2, 93. Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 227, 5-6: “TENVISQVE LAGEOS quae latine leporaria dicitur. ‘tenuis’ autem penetrabilis, quae cito descendit ad venas.”

¹³⁷ Bern, Burgerbibliothek MS 172 and MS 167. There is evidence that the original collection may also have had scholia on the *Aeneid*, as suggested by Paul Lehmann’s study of an Orosius commentary. See Paul Lehmann, “Reste und Spuren antiker Gelehrsamkeit in mittelalterlichen Texten,” in *Erforschung des Mittelalters: Ausgewählte Abhandlungen und Aufsätze*, ed. Paul Lehmann, 5 vols. (Stuttgart, 1959-1961), 2: 29-37.

¹³⁸ For example, the colophon to the *Explanatio in Bucolica Vergilii* is closely related to the colophon in the Bern scholia which appears after the comments on the *Eclogues*. For discussion of the collection, see David Daintree, “Virgil and Virgil Scholia in Early Medieval Ireland,” *Romanobarbarica* 16 (1999), 347-61; Daintree and Mario Geymonat, “Scholia non serviana,” in *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* IV (Rome, 1988), pp. 706-20.

¹³⁹ The name Iunius Philargyrius appears in the colophons of the *Explanationes*. In the Bern scholia, the name is given as Iunilius Flagrius, the spelling of which is generally normalised to Philargyrius. Moreover, in the notes of the Bern scholia the following “otherwise shadowy ancient authorities” are

divided the collection into two recensions: *a* and *b*. Redaction *a* comprises the *Explanationes in Bucolica* and the *Brevis Expositio*, both found in three French manuscripts;¹⁴⁰ redaction *b* consists of a more substantial set of glosses on the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* now preserved in whole or in part in seventy-two manuscripts, amongst which are two witnesses from Bern (Burgerbibliothek, MSS 167 and 172) which gave the collection its name.¹⁴¹ Debate surrounds the origin of the Bern scholia, as well as its relationship to the *Explanationes* and *Brevis expositio*. According to Funaioli we are dealing with a single late antique collection of scholia preserved in two recensions which was originally assembled in the fifth century in a Milanese school, the existence of which, however, has subsequently been questioned.¹⁴² The most recent editor of a portion of the Bern scholia, Luca Cadili, follows in the footsteps of Funaioli.¹⁴³ He edits the Bern scholia on book 1 of the *Georgics* side by side with the *Brevis expositio* as two recensions of a single collection. He refers to these recensions as *Scholia Bernensia A* (ΣBA) and *Scholia Bernensia B* (ΣBB). The former comprises the *Explanationes* on the *Eclogues* and *Brevis expositio* on the *Georgics*, the latter “a larger set of interpretations on these Vergilian poems.”¹⁴⁴ Cadili argues that the formation of the Bern scholia dates back to Late Antiquity, suggesting that the “proto collection” (for which he uses the

named: Gaudentius, Titus Gallus, and Leonimus, two of whom are mentioned in the colophon of the Bern scholia. Moreover, as Miles notes in *Heroic saga*, p. 29, a number of these authorities appear in Irish material such as the St. Gall commentary on Priscian and a Hiberno-Latin commentary on Orosius. For the colophons, see Daintree, “Virgil and Virgil Scholia,” pp. 347-61, at 351-352.

¹⁴⁰ Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, plut. 45.14; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 7960 and MS lat. 11308.

¹⁴¹ Funaioli, *Esegesi Virgiliana Antica*, pp. 8-36. See also Bischoff, *Katalog* 1, Nr. 542, p. 114; Nr. 545, p. 115.

¹⁴² See David Daintree, “Scholia Bernensia on Eclogues 4,” in Ziolkowski and Putnam, *The Virgilian Tradition*, p. 675.

¹⁴³ *Scholia Bernensia in Vergilii Bucolica et Georgica. Vol II. Fasc. I: In Georgica Commentarii (Prooemium/Liber I 1-42)*, ed. Luca Cadili et al. (Amsterdam, 2003).

¹⁴⁴ Cadili, “Scholia and Authorial Identity,” pp. 194-95.

siglum ΣB) appears to have been copied in uncial script at the end of the fifth or beginning of the sixth century.¹⁴⁵ As for the transmission of this collection, it underwent an “Insular phase.”¹⁴⁶ The existence of many Old Irish glosses in both recensions of the *Explanationes*, as well as the appearance of an Irish name in the colophon of *Explanatio I* and the survival of a few Old Irish glosses on the *Brevis expositio*, bear witness to an Irish contribution.¹⁴⁷ This has led to debate, with some scholars arguing that the collection was assembled in early medieval Ireland and others that it was edited there.¹⁴⁸ What is clear is that the Bern scholia consist of related sets of glosses which have survived in Carolingian codices.¹⁴⁹ That Bern scholia should be found in the Harley manuscript is thus no surprise.

The comments on the *Eclogues* in Harley 2782 consist of an amalgam of Servius and Bern scholia. The same mixture appears in Trier MS 1086 (saec. IX¹ or 2, Tours) and Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS lat. 394 (saec. IX^{4/4}, prov. St. Amand).¹⁵⁰ According to Funaioli, both the Trier and Valenciennes manuscripts transmit a miscellany of notes from redaction *b* of the *silloge Filargiriana* and Servius.¹⁵¹ Amongst the large number of manuscripts transmitting recension *b*,

¹⁴⁵ Cadili, “Scholia and Authorial Identity,” pp. 196 and 201.

¹⁴⁶ Cadili, “Scholia and Authorial Identity,” p. 204.

¹⁴⁷ For the colophon, see Lambert, “Les gloses celtiques,” pp. 87-88; Daintree, “Virgil and Virgil Scholia,” p. 351; Herren, “Literary and Glossarial Evidence,” pp. 57-59; Miles, *Heroic Saga*, pp. 31-32.

¹⁴⁸ These two opposing viewpoints are held by Brent Miles and Michael Herren. Miles, *Heroic Saga*, p. 32 argues that there is no need “to posit a separate late antique collection ... distinct from the one which we know existed in Ireland and was taken to the continent, replete with Christian content and glosses in Old Irish.” Miles calls the entire collection the “Irish Filargirian collection.” Herren, “Literary and Glossarial Evidence,” pp. 55-61 and 67, on the other hand, argues that the collection was edited in Ireland.

¹⁴⁹ For convenience, I use the term “Bern scholia” to denote these closely related commentaries.

¹⁵⁰ The origin of the Valenciennes manuscript is unclear but its provenance, according to Funaioli, *Esegesi*, pp. 22-23, is St. Amand. Bischoff, *Katalog III*, Nr. 6388, p. 399, does not provide a place of origin for the commentary on Virgil in Valenciennes 394, but says it is probably last quarter of the ninth century. My thanks to Silvia Ottaviano for sending me her unpublished notes on Harley 2782 which confirm my observation that the comments on the *Eclogues* are strikingly similar to those in TE.

¹⁵¹ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 222.

Funaioli identifies a number of closely-related witnesses and sorts them into three groups.¹⁵² In the last group he lists the Trier and Valenciennes manuscripts as “recensioni consimili”¹⁵³:

- i) Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 172 (**B**) (saec. IX^{2/3}, Paris region or Fleury) and Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 167 (**C**) (saec. IX^{3/3}, Brittany, Auxerre, Fleury?)¹⁵⁴
- ii) Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Vossianus Latinus Folio 79 + Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 1750 (**V**) (saec. IX^{4/4}, southern France)¹⁵⁵
- iii) Trier, Stadtbibliothek, MS 1086 (**T**) (saec. IX, first or second quarter, Tours) and Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS lat. 394 (**E**) (saec. IX^{4/4}, prov. St. Amand)

The third group is very interesting. Funaioli demonstrates that some of the additional material in Servius Danielis was taken from a manuscript very similar to **TE**.¹⁵⁶ Funaioli transcribes comments in **TE** which coincide with **BC** and **V** as well as with Servius and observes that there is close similarity between some of the notes in **TE** and **V** on the first *Eclogue*.¹⁵⁷ The commentary on the *Eclogues* in the Harley manuscript overlaps with many of the manuscripts listed above, but has its

¹⁵² Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 71.

¹⁵³ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 225 identifies common errors in both.

¹⁵⁴ Bischoff, *Katalog* 1, Nr. 542, p. 114 and Nr. 545, p. 115; Savage, “The Manuscripts of the Commentary of Servius Danielis,” pp. 96-105; Marco Mostert, *The Library of Fleury: A Provisional List of Manuscripts* (Hildesheim, 1989), BF093, p. 60. For an overview of the possible origins of Bern MS 172 and MS 167, see Ottaviano, *La tradizione delle opere di Virgilio tra IX e XI sec.*, pp. 141-43 and 184-85.

¹⁵⁵ Bischoff, *Katalog* 2, Nr. 2202, p. 54.

¹⁵⁶ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, pp. 46-47. Silvia Ottaviano refers to Funaioli’s findings in her notes on the Harley manuscript which she sent to me.

¹⁵⁷ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, pp. 119 and 151.

closest relationship with **TE**. The notes on the first *Eclogue* of Harley 2782 and **V** also share some similarities. In other words, Harley 2782 belongs to the group **TE** and has links with **V** (see below). Consequently, we can add Harley 2782 to the **TE** group identified by Funaioli.

For the most part, the variorum commentary on the *Eclogues* in Harley 2782 closely resembles that in **TE**.¹⁵⁸ The notes in the Trier manuscript, which are written in two columns, start on *Eclogue* 1, 53 (hence we can not find parallels between the Trier and Harley manuscripts for the first part of the first *Eclogue*). The missing comments in **T**, however, can be supplied by **E** and now also by the Harley manuscript. Below I list a number of notes from the commentary on the *Eclogues* in Harley 2782 found in **T** (comments start after *Eclogue* 1, 53) and **E**. Parallels also exist between Harley 2782, Servius, *Explanations*, **B**, **C** and **V**. However, it is only with **TE** that there is identical arrangement of information. The Harley manuscript thus agrees with **TE** against **B**, **C**, and **V**, as the examples below demonstrate. The examples often provide allegorical interpretations of figures, places, and events in Vergil's *Eclogues* (e.g. we find references to Augustus, the founder of the Roman Empire, and to Vergil himself). Most of the interpretations do not appear in Servius and thus represent an addition to his commentary. The first two examples elucidate the passage in Vergil on the exile of the herdsman Meliboeus whose lands have been confiscated in the wake of civil war and on the good fortune of his friend Tityrus:

¹⁵⁸ There are also differences between the comments in **T**, **E**, and the Harley manuscript. Silvia Ottaviano suggested to me that it would be useful to examine these; such an examination may form part of a future study.

Eclogue 1,3

HARLEY 2782	E	C	V
NOS PATRIAE FINES ¹⁵⁹ et reliqua linquimus non uoluntate, sed ui Caesaris et militum eius compulsi uicto Antonio (fol. 165v29)	NOS PATRIAE FINES et reliqua linquimus non uoluntate, sed ui Caesaris et militum eius compulsi uicto Antonio (fol. 56v16- 17) ¹⁶⁰	LINQVIMVS non uoluntate, sed ui Caesaris militumque eius compulsi uicto Antonio (fol. 6v14-15) ¹⁶²	NOS PATRIAE FINES LINQVIMVS linquimus non uoluntate, sed ui Caesaris uicto Antonio (fol. 1v24)
DVLCIA ARVA unicuique propria terra dulcis sibi uidetur, nec non omnis res delectationem habens dulcis appellatur (fol. 165v30)	DVLCIA ARVA unicuique propria terra dulcis sibi uidetur, nec non omnis res delectationem habens dulcis appellatur ^{p.c.} (fol. 56v17-19) ¹⁶¹	DVLCIA formonsa, uel pro sapore (fol. 6v14) ¹⁶³	DVLCIA a lin ... omnes res quae delectant (fol. 1v25) ¹⁶⁴

Eclogue 1,4

HARLEY 2782	E	C	V
NOS PATRIAM FVGIMVS magis est quam si dixisset “relinquimus” (fol. 165v31-32) ¹⁶⁵	NOS PATRIAM FVGIMVS magis est quam si dixisset “relinquimus” (fol. 56v20-21) ¹⁶⁶	NOS PATRIAM iteratio (fol. 6v16) ¹⁶⁸	NOS PATRIAM iteracio (fol. 1v26)
IN VMBRA Alligorice sub tutela imperatoris Augusti (fol. 165v32- 33)	IN VMBRA Alligorice sub tutela imperatoris Augusti (fol. 56v21- 22) ¹⁶⁷	-----	IN VMBRA In protectione Cesaris (fol. 1v27) ¹⁶⁹

¹⁵⁹ For the sake of clarity, I distinguish Vergilian lemmata from comments by using small caps. This is a deliberate deviation from the manuscript layout.

¹⁶⁰ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 120

¹⁶¹ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 120.

¹⁶² Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia*, p. 750.

¹⁶³ Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia*, p. 750.

¹⁶⁴ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 109.

¹⁶⁵ See Servius in Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 5, 13-14. The quotation from Horace in Servius is not transmitted in the Harley manuscript, E, or the Bern scholia.

¹⁶⁶ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 120.

¹⁶⁷ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 120.

¹⁶⁸ Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia*, p. 750.

¹⁶⁹ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 109

The third example interprets Amaryllida, beloved of Tityrus, as Rome; the fourth identifies the benefactor of Tityrus, Augustus:

Eclogue 1, 5

HARLEY 2782	E	C	V
FORMOSAM R. D. ET RELIQUA Amarillis nomen amice Tytyri, ac si diceret “doces formosam Amarillida resonare syluas.” Potest et ita intelligi “doces siluas resonare carmen,” quod de tua composuisti amica [Servius]. ¹⁷⁰ Tropice Roma sub Amarillidis persona, Tytyrus intellegitur Virgilius carmen bucolicum scribens et Romae poeticam artem docens ¹⁷¹ (fol. 165v33-35)	FORMOSAM R. D. ET RELIQUA Amarillis nomen amice Tytyri, ac si diceret “doces formosam Amarillida resonare siluas.” Potest et ita intellegi “doces siluas resonare carmen,” quod de tua composuisti amica. Tropice Roma sub Amarillidis persona, Tytyrus intellegitur Virgilius carmen bocolicum scribens et Romae poeticam artem docens (fol. 56v22-26) ¹⁷²	FORMONSAM pro “formonsae” uel heret ad “patria.” RESONARE ut resonet. AMARILLIDA accusatiuus grecus est. Formonsam Amarillida amicam Tityri dicit, uel Amarillidas, sed excluditur de metro (fol. 6v17- 19) ¹⁷³	FORMOSAM RESONARE DOCES AMARILLIDA accusatiuus grecus. Tropice ad Maronem hoc dicitur docentem in Roma artem poeticam. Amarillis Romam allegorice significat uel ut quibusdam uidetur duarum amicarum nomina <sunt> Amarillis et Galatea (fol. 1v27-29) ¹⁷⁴

Eclogue 1, 6

HARLEY 2782	E	C	V
O MELIBOE et reliqua. O execrantis et inuidientis interiectio. Meliboeus boum procurator dicitur. DEVS Augustus, quia imperatores post mortem in deos transferuntur. Augustus uero in uita honores dicitur promeruisse diuinos (fol. 165v35-37) ¹⁷⁵	O MELIBOE et reliqua. O execrantis et inuidientis interiectio. Meliboeus boum procurator dicitur. DEVS Augustus, quia imperatores post mortem in deos transferuntur. Augustus uero in uita honores dicitur promeruisse diuinos (fol. 56v26-29) ¹⁷⁶	O execrantis et inuidientis interiectio. MELIBOEE bouum curator, ex greco et latino compositum. DEVS Augustus uel deus omnipotens ut uinilius [<i>lege</i> Iunilius] dicit. DEVS qui [<i>lege</i> quia] imperatores post mortem in deos transferuntur;	O MELEBOEE deus nobis. O execrantis et inuidientis interiectio. DEVS Augustus uel Iollus (fol. 2r1) ¹⁷⁸

¹⁷⁰ See Servius in Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 5, 16-17.

¹⁷¹ See also *Explanationes* I and II in Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.2: 16, 1-2.

¹⁷² Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 120.

¹⁷³ Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia*, p. 750.

¹⁷⁴ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 109. See also *Explanatio* II in Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.2: 16, 1-5.

¹⁷⁵ See Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 5, 24

		Augustus uero in uita ut <H>oratus ait (fol. 6v19-23) ¹⁷⁷	
--	--	--	--

The fifth example furnishes another allegorical allusion, this time to the emperor and his youth; and the final example, reading “certantibus” for “cantantibus,” muses on the difficulties in expounding everything in the *Bucolics*:

Eclogue 2, 51

HARLEY 2782	T	E	B	V
LANVGINE dicit enim de lanugine barbae suae cum sim iuuenis cur me refugis. Tropice autem ipse ego, actauiane [<i>lege</i> Octauiane] Caesar, omni te carmine rustico prosequar (fol. 168v29-30) ¹⁷⁹	LANVGINE dicit enim de lanugine barbae suae cum sim iuuenis cur me refugis. Tropice autem ipse ego, Octauiane Caesar, omni te carmine rustico prosequar (fol. 2va44-b1) ¹⁸⁰	LANVGINE dicit enim de lanugine barbae suae cum sim iuuenis cur me refugis. Tropice autem ipse ego, Octauiane Caesar, omni te carmine rustico prosequar (fol. 63v14-16) ¹⁸¹	LANVGINE uel de lanugine barbae suae dicit, hac si diceret: cum sim iuuenis, cur me refugis? hoc est Octauianae uel puer (fol. 7v) ¹⁸²	LANVGINE uel lanugim herbe [<i>lege</i> lanugine barbae] sue dicit, hac si diceret cum sim iuuenis cur me fugis? hoc est Octauianae uel puer (fol. 6r4-5)

*Eclogue 10, 75-76*¹⁸³

¹⁷⁶ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 120.

¹⁷⁸ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 109. Funaioli incorrectly has *Iolla*.

¹⁷⁷ Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia*, p. 750.

¹⁷⁹ Savage, “The Scholia on Virgil’s *Eclogues* in Harleian 2782,” p. 275.

¹⁸⁰ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 129.

¹⁸¹ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 129.

¹⁸² See Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia*, p. 762. Line numbers are not provided for **B** which has marginal notes not a running commentary as found in the margins in **C**.

¹⁸³ For comments on these lines, I was unfortunately unable to check what **V** transmits as I do not have a complete microfilm of the manuscript. Other examples of parallels between the Harley manuscript, **T** and **E** are as follows: “OTIA id est imperator Augustus hanc nobis tribuit securitatem” (*Eclogue 1, 6*, fol. 165v37-38; **E**, fol. 56v30, see also **V**, fol. 2r2: “OTIA Deus nobis haec otia fecit id est Augustus nobis hanc securi[ta]tem tribuit”; Funaioli, *Esegesi*, pp. 109 and 120); “Aliter per ‘sordida rura’ et ‘casas humiles’ ad bucolicum carmen prouocat imperatorem, per ceruos figendos hostes persequi” (*Eclogue 2, 28-29*, fol. 168r35-36; **TE**; Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 128; Savage, “The Scholia on Virgil’s *Eclogues* in Harleian 2782,” p. 274); “Labellum diminutium est a labro quod est inferius, nam

HARLEY 2782	T	E	B	C
SVRGAMVS ait id est finiamus humile bucolicum carmen. SOLET ESSE GRAVIS CERTANTIBVS VMBRA id est difficile est omnia sub sensu in bucolicis constringere, quae per iuniperos uult figurate intelligi (fol. 181v18-20)	SVRGAMVS ait id est finiamus humile bucolicum carmen. SOLET ESSE GRAVIS CERTANTIBVS VMBRA id est difficile est omnia sub sensu in bucolicis constringere, quae per iuniperos uult figurate intelligi (fol. 12vb42- 45) ¹⁸⁴	SVRGAMVS ait id est finiamus humile bocolicom carmen. SOLET ESSE GRAVIS CERTANTIBVS VMBRA id est difficile est omnia sub sensu in bocolicis constringere, quae per iuniperos uult figurate intellegi (fol. 90v17-20) ¹⁸⁵	SVRGAMVS finiamus carmen. GRAVIS id est psarum [lege plantarum] agrestium umbra grauis certantibus, uel quia difficile est omnia sub sensu constringere in Bocolicis (fol. 23v) ¹⁸⁶	SVRGAMVS finiamus carmen. GRAVIS id est psarum [lege plantarum] agrestium umbra grauis certantibus, uel quia difficile est omnia sub sensu constringere in Bocolicis (fol. 20r28-30) ¹⁸⁷

The above examples clearly demonstrate a close affinity between Harley 2782, T, and E. That the Harley manuscript belongs to the TE family is further evidenced by the ties between some of its notes and those in V. Funaioli edited the new material in V and identified parallels with TE.¹⁸⁸ The Harley manuscript conforms to the same pattern. Parallels with V can be found in the notes on the first book of the *Eclogues*, as the examples below demonstrate. The comments are not in BC. The first example identifies Mantua as an area where land was confiscated in the wake of civil war; the second explains why a lamb and not a sheep is chosen for sacrifice;

superius labium uocatur" (*Eclogue* 2, 34, fol. 168r44-45; TE; Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 128; Savage, "The Scholia on Virgil's *Eclogues* in Harleian 2782," p. 275).

¹⁸⁴ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 141.

¹⁸⁵ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 141.

¹⁸⁶ Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia*, p. 837.

¹⁸⁷ Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia*, p. 837.

¹⁸⁸ For the new material in V, see Funaioli, *Esegesi*, pp. 106-19. For overlap with TE, see Funaioli, *Esegesi*, pp. 119-41.

the third provides help with word order and includes a variant reading

("turbamur") also found in Servius.¹⁸⁹

Eclogue 1, 3

HARLEY 2782	E	V
Alligorice uoce utitur Mantuanorum qui suis possessionibus expellabantur (fol. 165v31) ¹⁹⁰	Alligorice uoce utitur Mantuanorum qui suis possessionibus expellebantur ¹⁹¹ (fol. 56v19-20)	NOS PATRIAE FINES uoce Mantuanorum utitur qui expellabantur suis possessionibus (fol. 1v25) ¹⁹²

Eclogue 1, 8

HARLEY 2782	E	V
Quare agnus et non ouis. Quia agnus plus sanguinis habet quam lactis (fol. 165v43-44)	Quare agnus et non ouis. Quia agnus plus sanguinis habet quam lactis (fol. 57r7-8) ¹⁹³	AGNVS non ouuis [<i>lege</i> ouis] quod plus sanguinis quam lactis habet (fol. 2r6) ¹⁹⁴

Eclogue 1, 11

HARLEY 2782	E	V
MIROR MAGIS hinc subdistingue et tunc infer quae sequuntur; id est miror unde tibi tanta securitas uenit. VNDIQVE TOTIS et cetera, est enim ordo: adeo, id est in tantum, a totis agris turbatur uel turbamur, ut et ego aeger ipse pecora	MIROR MAGIS hic subdistingue et tunc infer quae sequuntur; id est miror unde tibi tanta securitas uenit. VNDIQVE TOTIS et cetera, est enim ordo: adeo, id est in tantum, a totis agris turbatur uel turbamur, ut et ego aeger ipse pecora	MIROR MAGIS id est unde tibi tanta securitas aduenit. VNDIQVE TOTIS et reliqua, id est a totis agris turbati expellimur, excludimur, ut ego non sinar requiescere (fol. 2r11-12) ¹⁹⁶

¹⁸⁹ For the correct reading ("turbatur") and textual variant ("turbamur") on *Eclogue 1, 12*, see Ottaviano, *La tradizione delle opere di Virgilio tra IX e XI sec.*, p. 78.

¹⁹⁰ The line is also in Daniel's edition and is included in the critical apparatus in Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 5.

¹⁹¹ *expellabantur*^{a.c.}

¹⁹² Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 109. Funaioli has *expellebantur*.

¹⁹³ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 121.

¹⁹⁴ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 109.

pascens requiescere non sinar (fol. 166r2-4).	pascens requiescere non sinar (fol. 57v21-24) ¹⁹⁵	
--	---	--

What, then, can be said of the variorum commentary on the *Eclogues* in Harley 2782? The comments are strikingly similar to those in **T** and **E**, manuscripts which Funaioli has chosen as representatives of a distinct subgroup within the Bern scholia. The Trier manuscript, dated to the first or second quarter of the ninth century, may very well have been written at Tours.¹⁹⁷ The origin of the Valenciennes manuscript, dated to the last quarter of the ninth century, is uncertain. Its provenance, however, is St. Amand.¹⁹⁸ There are also similarities between the Harley manuscript and **V**, a manuscript which was written in southern France in the last quarter of the ninth century and was, according to Bischoff, produced “unter Mitwirkung eines spanischen Schreibers.”¹⁹⁹ In this connection it may be interesting to note that a Mozarabic hymn is copied on fol. 164v of the Harley manuscript:

En ob infirmos tibi subplicamus
Quos noc<ens> pestis ualitudo quassat
Vt pius morbo releues iacentes
Quo quatiantur

¹⁹⁶ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 109.

¹⁹⁵ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 121.

¹⁹⁷ Savage, “The Manuscripts of Servius’s Commentary,” pp. 173-77; Murgia, *Prolegomena*, pp. 36-37.

¹⁹⁸ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, pp. 22-23 and 444.

¹⁹⁹ Bischoff, *Katalog* II, Nr. 2202, p. 54.

The hymn, dated to between the seventh and eighth centuries,²⁰⁰ is one of a number of Mozarabic hymns which have been grouped together under the title “in variis occasionibus.”²⁰¹ Justo Pérez de Urbel argues that the hymn is perhaps “uno de tantos como pasaron de España al resto de Europa.”²⁰² The appearance of this hymn in Harley 2782 presumably reflects the well-known links between Carolingian hymnody and the rich hymnological tradition of Spain.²⁰³ And perhaps manuscripts such as V were conduits of Mozarabic material into Carolingian manuscripts containing Servius.

Another manuscript linked to Harley 2782 and TE is Valenciennes, Bibliothèque municipale, MS lat. 178 (F).²⁰⁴ Funaioli discovered that this twelfth-century codex has two front flyleaves in its binding transmitting a fragment of Vergil’s *Eclogues* 6 and 7. Bischoff ascribes these flyleaves to a (northern) French centre and dates them to the first or second quarter of the ninth century.²⁰⁵ The Vergilian text on these flyleaves is accompanied by contemporary annotations in a

²⁰⁰ See Joseph Szövérfy, *Iberian Latin Hymnody: Survey and Problems*, Classical Folia Editions (Albany, N.Y., 1971, repr. 1998), p. 45. For an edition of the hymn and summary of its history, see *Hymnodia Hispanica*, in CCSL 167, ed. José Castro Sánchez, (Turnhout, 2010), pp. 727-29, 857-58.

²⁰¹ *Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi* 27, ed. Clemens Blume and Guido M. Dreves (Leipzig, 1897), pp. 263-87, nos. 187-210. Silvia Ottaviano pointed out to me that a Mozarabic hymn, written by a later hand and accompanied by neumes, is also to be found on fol. 154r of Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS lat. 7926 (saec. IX^{2/4}, Auxerre, Fleury?), a glossed Vergil manuscript. See also Bischoff, *Katalog* 3, Nr. 4514, p. 136.

²⁰² Justo Pérez de Urbel, “Origen de los himnos mozárabes,” *Bulletin Hispanique* 28 (1926), 5-21, 113-39, 209-45, 305-20, at p. 238.

²⁰³ Ruth E. Messenger, “The Mozarabic Hymnal,” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 75 (1944), 103-26 points out that the Mozarabic liturgists were familiar with a hymn attributed to Paulinus of Aquileia and that Alcuin borrowed from Mozarabic sources. For links between Carolingian hymnody and the Mozarabic hymnal, see Szövérfy, *Iberian Latin Hymnody*, pp. 51-52. The seventh century appears to have been a very productive period for Visigothic-Mozarabic hymn writing. See Ruth E. Messenger, “Mozarabic Hymns in Relation to Contemporary Culture in Spain,” *Traditio* 4 (1946), 149-77. For Visigothic/Mozarabic hymnodists, see also Joseph Szövérfy, *A Concise History of Medieval Latin Hymnody: Religious Lyrics between Antiquity and Humanism* (Leiden, 1985), pp. 26-28.

²⁰⁴ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 226.

²⁰⁵ These flyleaves are part of a now fragmentary manuscript: Valenciennes MS lat. 178 + 220. See Bischoff, *Katalog* 3, Nr. 6366, p. 397; Munk Olsen, *L’étude*, p. 775.

different hand. These annotations are identical to comments in **TE** and Harley 2782.²⁰⁶ Hence, the very same selection of material appears in different forms: as an independent running commentary and as marginal annotations. The same can be said for Servius and the Bern scholia more generally, both of which are found as running texts and as glosses.²⁰⁷ In Harley 2782 and **F**, then, we can chart the intersection between independent commentaries and early medieval glosses.

And what about the actual composition of the commentary on the *Eclogues* in Harley 2782 and **TE**? The variorum text draws heavily on Servius, whose work is interspersed with Bern scholia, as the following examples from the Harley manuscript demonstrate. In the first example, the compiler adds the word “securus” to Servius’s “otiosus,” amalgamating comments from Servius and the Bern scholia. Both words function as synonyms for the lemma “lentus.” In the second case, the compiler mentions Servius twice and appears aware that he is conflating material from various sources:

Eclogue 1, 4

LENTVS otiosus [Servius] siue securus [*Explanationes, Scholia Bernensia*].²⁰⁸

Eclogue 1, 12

²⁰⁶ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 24 discovered that the notes in **TE** were identical to the annotations in Valenciennes 178. The following comment in Harley 2782 (fol. 175r43-44) appears also in **T** (fol. 9r), **E** (fol. 77v) and Valenciennes 178: “ERRABVND A BOVIS V: illud expressit, quod incedentes flexis pedibus gradiuntur boues”; on *Eclogue 6*, 58; see also Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 76, 5-7.

²⁰⁷ For instance, Bern scholia are copied as a running text in Harley 2782 and as marginal glosses in Bern, Burgerbibliothek MS 172.

²⁰⁸ Fol. 165v32. See also Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 5, 15; Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.2: 15, 26-27; Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia*, p. 750.

VSQUE ADEO TVRBAMVR AGRIS turbamur sine ulla discretione culpaue meriti. Et inuidiose latenter tempora carpit Augusti [Servius], quia Sylla prius iussit dominos agrorum habere partes quibus uiuerent quod negat Augustum fecisse [*Explanatio II, Scholia Bernensia*]. Sane “turbatur” uera lectio est ut Seruius dicit ut sit impersonaliter dictum et non ad paucos sed ad omnes referri <uidetur>²⁰⁹ [Servius].²¹⁰

What further can be said of the Harley commentary on the *Eclogues*? At times, the complete vulgate Servius was not furnished. In the comment below on *Eclogue* 1, 19 looking at Rome and pointing out a figure of speech (for which there is an identical note in E), I first list parallels with Servius and indicate in bold the section of Servius that is omitted. In the second table I show parallels with other sources:

HARLEY 2782, fol. 166r19-24; E, fol. 57v17-25 ²¹¹	SERVIUS
VRBEM QVAM DICVNT ROMAM pro urbe significat, inuentum pro inuentore [<i>Bern Scholia</i>]. Queritur, cur de Caesare interrogatus, Romam describat. Et aut simplicitate utitur rustica, ut ordinem narrationis rectum non teneat, sed per longas ambages ad interrogata descendat: aut certe quia nullus, qui ²¹² continetur, est ²¹³	VRBEM QVAM DICVNT ROMAM quaeritur, cur de Caesare interrogatus, Romam describit. Et aut simplicitate utitur rustica, ut ordinem narrationis plenum non teneat, sed per longas ambages ad interrogata descendat: aut certe quia nullus, qui continetur, est sine ea re, quae continet, nec potest ulla persona esse sine loco: unde necesse habuit

²⁰⁹ Comparison with Thilo’s edition indicates that the last line of the comment (“Sane turbatur ... referri”) draws here on Servius in abbreviated form.

²¹⁰ Fol. 165v48-166r2. See Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 6, 22-26; Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.2: 17, 9-13; Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia*, p. 750. Other examples are, on fol. 167r23-25, commenting on *Eclogue* 1, 66: “DIVISOS quia olim Britannia orbi terrarum fuit coniuncta, uel quia inter se et orbem maria multa conueniunt [*Bern scholia*]: est enim insula reposita in Oceano septemtrionali et a poetis alter orbis terrarum dicitur [Servius; *Explanatio I*]”; see Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia*, p. 755; Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 15, 7-9; Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.2: 28, 12-16; on fol. 174r40-43, commenting on *Eclogue* 6, 6: “NAMQVE SVPER TIBI ERVNT superabundabunt tibi, inquit, o Vare, qui tua facta describere cupiant. Hic autem Varus Germanos uicerat et exinde maximam fuerat gloriam et pecuniam consecutus: per quem Virgilius meruerat plurima [Servius]. Dicitur autem quod uicto Antonio Caesar Augustus Varum in loco Pollionis subsistuerit, qui praeesset Transpadane regioni, cui idcirco Virgilius adulatur [*Bern scholia*]”; see Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 65, 25-29; Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.2: 106, 15-19; Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia*, p. 794.

²¹¹ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 122.

²¹² qui^{p.c.} om. E.

²¹³ est^{p.c.} om. E.

sine ea re, quae continet. Est autem longum hyperbaton “urbem quam dicunt Romam. hic illum uidi Meliboe” ²¹⁴ [Servius]. Roma ante Romulum fuit et ab ea Romulus nomen adquisiuit. Sed de flaua et candida Roma <A>esculapi filia nouum nomen Latio ²¹⁵ facit, tamen conditricis nomine omnes Romani uocantur Marinus Luperorum poeta dixit [Bern Scholia]	interrogatus de Caesare locum describere, in quo eum uiderat. Est autem longum hyperbaton “urbem quam dicunt Romam. hic illum uidi Meliboe” ²¹⁶
---	---

<i>Explanatio I</i>	<i>Explanatio II</i>	C	V
VRBEM id est Romam id est poetae vox, per metonymiam id est inuentum per inuentorem et inuentorem per inuentum. Roma et ante Romulum fuit et ab ea sibi nomen adquisisse Marianus Luperorum poeta sic ostendit: Sed de flauo et cano [sic] ita Roma Aesculapi filia nouum nomen Latio facit, quod conditricis nomine ab ipso omnes Romam uocant ²¹⁷	VRBEM QVAM DICVNT id est poetae. Per urbem significat inuentum per inuentorem et inuentorem per inuentum. ROMAM id est Roma et ante Romulum fuit et ab ea sibi Romulus nomen adquisiuit. Marianus Luperorum poeta sic ostendit: Sed de flava et cano [sic] ita Roma Aesculapi filia nouum nomen Latio facit, quod ab ipso nomine omnes Romam uocant ²¹⁸	VRBEM pro in urbe significat, inuentum per inuentorem (fol. 6v) ²¹⁹	VRBEM QVAM DICVNT urbem pro in urbe, inuentum per inuentorem. “Vrbem quam dicunt Romam” Roma ante Romulum fuit et ab eo sibi nomen Romulus adquesiuit: sed de flaua et candida romes colapi [lege Roma Aesculapi] filia nouum nomen Latio facit tamen conditoris uel conditricis nomine omnes Romani uocantur (fol. 2r26-28) ²²⁰

In the commentary on the *Eclogues* in Harley 2782, then, we find an amalgam of Servius and Bern scholia and an almost identical version in TE. This furnishes insight into the possible origins of the Harley manuscript. To begin with, a link with Tours seems probable, as already noted by Savage, who maintains that the

²¹⁴ Meliboe, E.

²¹⁵ ratio E.

²¹⁶ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 7, 23-30

²¹⁷ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.2: 19, 5-16.

²¹⁸ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.2: 19, 5-16.

²¹⁹ Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia*, p. 751.

²²⁰ Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 110.

script of the Harley manuscript suggests Tours and that the text “follows the Tours tradition.”²²¹ The commentary on the *Eclogues* in the Harley manuscript, also in **T**, a manuscript thought to have been written at Tours, furnishes another clue as to possible ties with the centre. And there are errors unique to **T**, **E**, Harley 2782, and sometimes **V**, that is, in manuscripts some of which are connected with Tours.²²² Further links with Tours appear in the form of errors and punctuation. The Harley manuscript transmits errors, for example, “maculari” (*lege iaculari*) on the commentary on *Eclogue* 2, 29 (fol. 168r34) and “uitulam” (*lege uitula*) on the commentary on *Eclogue* 3, 77 (fol. 170v32).²²³ Both errors, though not unique to manuscripts from Tours, are found in three manuscripts from the centre: **T**, Paris lat. 7959, and Bern, Burgerbibliothek, MS 165 (saec. IX^{2/4}, Tours).²²⁴ In addition, *Z* notae, also found in **T**, are deployed throughout the commentaries on the *Georgics* and *Aeneid* in Harley 2782. And finally, there is heavy punctuation in the commentary on the *Georgics* in Harley 2782, especially a dot and a down-stroke. This feature appears in manuscripts from Tours and was used there to denote a whole pause. We also find a dot and an up-stroke in the commentary on the *Georgics*, a feature deployed at Tours to denote a half pause.²²⁵

²²¹ Savage, “The Manuscripts of Servius’s Commentary,” p. 188.

²²² For example, the Harley manuscript, **E**, and **V** transmit “expellabantur” [*lege expellebantur*] (see above the comment on *Eclogue* 1, 3). In **E** the word is corrected by the text hand. And sometimes **T** agrees with the Harley manuscript. For example, both **T** and Harley 2782 have the error “pro” [*lege per*] as against “per” in **E** in the following comment: “‘Tua cura’ de quibus tibi cura est [= **B**] Alligorice potest pro [per **E**] mel dulcedo carminis et aues cantantes multitudo scolasticorum carmina componentium designari”; fol. 167r9-10; **T**, fol. 1r15-18; **E**, fol. 59v18-20, commenting on *Eclogue* 1, 57; for the entry on fol. 6r in **B** see Funaioli, *Esegesi*, p. 124 and Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia*, p. 754.

²²³ Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 23, 7; 39, 15.

²²⁴ The corruptions are found on fol. 4r and fol. 6r in Bern, Burgerbibliothek MS 165. The errors are also in **T**, fol. 2rb12 and fol. 4rb41, and in Paris lat. 7959, fol. 7r29 and fol. 10v34.

²²⁵ Edward K. Rand, *A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours*, Studies in the Script of Tours 1 (Cambridge MA., 1929), p. 29. For punctuation in the Carolingian age, see Parkes, “Carolingian *renovatio*: Augmenting Old Notation with New Symbols,” in *Pause and Effect*, pp. 30-34.

Both in the original and added portion of Harley 2782, then, there is evidence that suggests a link between the Harleian manuscript and Tours (script, errors, punctuation, and the commentary on the *Eclogues*). However, the evidence is not unique to manuscripts from Tours. Hence it does not allow us to locate the Harley manuscript with certainty at this centre. With regards to origin, Murgia's and Bischoff's assessment that Harley 2782 originated in Northeast France seems reasonable and is confirmed by the available evidence, for example, by the variorum commentary on the *Eclogues*, which demonstrates that Harley 2782 and TE belong to a family of manuscripts circulating in Central and Northeastern France.

Conclusion

Harley 2782, the precise origin of which remains unknown, is a highly typical product of the Carolingian age. Copied anonymously by a number of scribes in Northeast France, the two codicological units display various distinguishing traits characteristic of manuscripts which can with certainty be linked to Tours. More conclusively, the Harley manuscript furnishes insight into the early medieval reception of Servius, which by the ninth century was well established and flourishing in Frankish centres. It attests to the high status of Servius, which is transcribed as an independent text, edited, corrected, glossed, marked for mythological information, provided with *NOTA* monograms and headings, as well as interspersed and augmented with *scholia adespota* and non-Servian material.

That Servius is transmitted alongside non-Servian additions in the second codicological unit of Harley 2782 is not surprising. Indeed, this practice underpins

the various cases of *Servius auctus*, the most famous example of which is Servius Danielis (DS), found in a number of important Carolingian witnesses.²²⁶ Ottaviano observed that “scholia non serviana” as found in a ninth-century glossed fragmentary Vergil manuscript from St. Emmeram (Regensburg) demonstrate “la circolazione nel IX sec. di materiali esegetici non direttamente ricavati dal commento serviano e probabilmente in parte antichi e analoghi a quelli consultati dal compilatore del cosiddetto *Servius auctus*.”²²⁷

In the Harley manuscript, the additions are mostly Bern scholia, which, in the commentary on the *Eclogues*, are intertwined with Servius. This accords with contemporary trends.²²⁸ The Harley manuscript demonstrates Carolingian interest in Servius, a vital source for the early medieval reception of Vergil. Servius’s work was not only copied and edited, but also, as we have seen, in the second codicological unit, expanded with Bern scholia, that is, with another late antique commentary tradition which sometimes transmits allegorical interpretation not found in Servius and thus represents an addition to Servius. Harley 2782, then, bears witness to the importance of Servius and to collections such as the Bern

²²⁶ See Savage, “The Manuscripts of the Commentary of Servius Danielis,” pp. 77-121.

²²⁷ Ottaviano, “Scholia non serviana,” pp. 243-44.

²²⁸ In the Carolingian period, Servius is often found alongside other material in glossed Vergil manuscripts: in Bern MS 172 and MS 167, Bern scholia appear in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* and DS scholia in the *Aeneid*; in Montpellier, Bibliothèque interuniversitaire, Section Médecine, H 253 (saec. IX^{2/3}, Northeast France?) Servius is sometimes mixed in with notes from the *Explanations in Bucolica Vergilii* of Iunius Philargyrius. For example, on fol. 9r, commenting on *Eclogue* 5, 20 we find: “DAPNIM Daphim alii dicunt filium Mercurii, qui dilectus fuit a Nimpha, qui fidem dedit ut se nullius alterius mulieris concubitu usurum. Alii dicunt Flaccum fratrem Virgilii qui iuuenis mortuus est. Alii Iulium Cesarem quem Romani interfecerunt. Sed istorialiter Mercurius intellegitur quem fleuit Nimpha postquam mortuus est”; see Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.1: 56-57; Thilo and Hagen, *Servii grammatici*, 3.2: 94, 4-14; Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia*, p. 786. For description of the manuscript see Bischoff, *Katalog* 2, Nr. 2852, p. 205. And Servius’s work is not only found alongside, intertwined with, or in the same volume as other commentaries and glosses, but was also an important source for them, for example, for the Bern scholia. A constant feature of Carolingian Vergil manuscripts was Servius who provided the bedrock of early medieval comments on Vergil.

scholia in the Carolingian age. The manuscript makes evident that late antique scholarship informed Carolingian reading of Vergil.

Crucially, Harley 2782 furnishes evidence for the vigorous appropriation of the most complete surviving Vergil commentary. Above all, the antiquarian, encyclopaedic and linguistic focus of Servius provides insight into why his work was accommodated to early medieval intellectual life and used to understand the most famous classical poet. The efforts of the Harleian scribes to preserve the integrity of Servius and to engage with his text in the codicological unit transmitting his commentaries on the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid* on the one hand, and to intertwine it with additional material in a different and differing second codicological unit transmitting his commentary on the *Eclogues* on the other, demonstrate that, by the ninth century, the most renowned commentator on Vergil had secured a solid foothold amongst the rank and file of the *antiqui*.²²⁹

²²⁹ My thanks to Marie Therese Flanagan and Silvia Ottaviano for their many helpful suggestions. I would especially like to thank the anonymous reader and Gernot Wieland for their invaluable comments and time spent on reading and commenting on this paper.